Archbiſhop TILLOTSON Vindicated

FROM

The Charge of *Socinianiſm.*

Bb-10-19
2.

REFLECTIONS

UPON

A LIBEL lately Printed,

ENTITULED,

[The Charge of *Socinianism* againſt Dr. TILLOTSON Conſider'd, *&c.*]

LONDON:

Printed for **Richard Chiſwell**, at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCXCVI.

1335:15

The CONTENTS.

THE Archbiſhop Vindicated,

SECT. I. *From the Charge of not uſing the Word* Conſubſtantial, Page 3

SECT. II. *From uſing the Word* Perſon *ſlightly, with ſome Reflections upon the* Animadverter *on the Dean of St.* Paul's, 11

SECT. III. *The Archbiſhop's Expoſition of* Phil. 2. 5. *Vindicated,* 17

SECT. IV. *The Charge about our Saviour's* Satisfaction, *and* Hell-Torments, *Anſwered,* 20

SECT. V. *The Charge diſproved of the Archbiſhop's advancing a* Barbarous, Abſurd, and Blaſphemous Notion of the Chriſtian Religion, 25

SECT. VI. *The Charge of* Blaſphemy *Anſwered about the* Jewiſh *Law,* 40

SECT. VII. *A ſecond Charge about our Saviour's* Satisfaction *Anſwered,* 45

SECT. VIII. *The Archbiſhop Vindicated from the Charge of Advancing a* Socinian Covenant, 47

SECT. IX. *The Charge Anſwered about* Chriſt's Sacrifice, 48

SECT. X. *Of the* Socinians *owning a* Satisfaction, 49

SECT. XI. *Of the* Socinian *way of Diſputing,* 50

SECT. XII. *The Charge of undermining the* Unity of the Godhead, *Anſwered,* 54

SECT. XIII. *The Charge of* Hobbiſm *Anſwered,* 55

SECT. XIV. *The Charge about* Revealed Religion *Anſwered,* 57

SECT. XV. *The Charge about* Mother's Nurſing their Children, *proved to be impertinent,* 59

SECT. XVI. *The Charge anſwered of Comparing the Archbiſhop with Mr.* Blount, *&c.* 61

SECT. XVII. *The Concluſion.* 64.

The Author's Abſence from the Preſs, which he could not overlook himſelf, has occaſioned the following

ERRATA.

Page 5. line 8. from bott. for *And tho here*, r. *Tho here*. p. 9. l. 6. r. quotes. p. 10. l. 3. from bott. after *Myſtery*, add *by the ſtrength of Reaſon*. p. 11. l. 6. from bott. r. *ſo teach them to keep*. p. 15. Marg. for *p.* 84. r. *p.* 87. p. 18. l. 19. r. *ipſo*. p. 22. l. 4. after *alſo* add *be not*. p. 30. l. 6. from bott. r. *to the contrary*. p. 34. l. *ult.* r. *'Tis indeed highly*. p. 39. l. 32. r. *excepts*. p. 49. l. 27. for *and as* r. *as*. p. 51. l. 30. r. *Affections*. p. 54. l. 26. for *Principal* r. *Principle*. p. 59. l. 17. for *putting* r. *put*. p. 62. l. 20. r. Archbiſhop. p. 63. l. 9. dele *it*. Smaller Miſtakes are left to the Reader's Candor.

REFLECTIONS

Upon a Libel lately Printed, Entituled, [*The Charge of* Socinianiſm *againſt Dr.* Tillotſon *Conſider'd.*]

IT has been long diſputed amongſt Wiſe men, Whether impudent and notorious Calumnies ſhould rather be buried in ſilence by the Perſons who ſuffer under them, or be expoſed as ſuch by ſolemn Vindications. They will dye of themſelves, ſay ſome men, Truth will prevail at the long run, and ſlanders only grow conſiderable when they are taken notice of. On the other hand, a Lye briskly affirmed is believed by weak and prejudiced Perſons; and there are great numbers of People who cannot bear up againſt poſitive boldneſs; and though upon examination they find no grounds for it, yet through a natural diffidence of their own Underſtandings, and an unwillingneſs to ſuppoſe that their Friends can be capable of ſuch Crimes, they will rather diſtruſt their Senſes, than not yield to the daring aſſertions of thoſe whoſe Perſons or Opinions they have a reſpect for. So that if one compares the Reaſons on both ſides, 'tis here, as it is in moſt other caſes where Prudence muſt determine it, ſometimes convenient, and ſometimes not, to Vindicate the Reputations of thoſe who are unjuſtly attack'd by the Tongues or Pens of wicked or malicious Perſons.

It ſeems to be very neceſſary when the injured Perſons are dead; and that from thence an opportunity is taken to ſpread thoſe

thoſe virulent ſlumnies which the Authors durſtnot have publiſhed when they were alive: Eſpecially if they have been inſtruments of much good whilſt they were in this world; and above all, if ſome of the beſt of their Actions are the very things for which they have ſo ſeverely ſuffered; then an obligation ſeems to lie upon thoſe that ſtay behind, to reſcue the Reputation of theſe their Teachers, Governors, or Benefactors, from the hands of thoſe who, if they can but throw dirt enough upon Honeſter and Better Men than themſelves (if they act upon Principles differeht from thoſe which they would appear to own) care not what miſchief they do to Religion and the Church of God.

For theſe Reaſons therefore it has been thought adviſable, That publick notice ſhould be taken of a Villanous Pamphlet lately diſperſed with great induſtry by the *Jacobites*, Entituled, *The Charge of* Socinianiſm *againſt Dr.* Tillotſon *Conſidered: In Examination of ſome Sermons he has lately Publiſhed on purpoſe to clear himſelf from that Imputation.* In which, as I hope fully to make appear, there is not one thing laid to that Great and that Good Man's Charge, but what is a direct Slander, and wherein the Author openly and deſignedly Miſrepreſents Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s meaning, or Miſquotes his Words, or makes him Teach Doctrines as different from thoſe which he really Teaches, as Light is from Darkneſs.

This, if it can be proved, will fall as heavy upon this Libeller, as he does upon the late Archbiſhop; only here is the unhappy difference, he that comes firſt has the opportunity of prepoſſeſſing thoſe who were already inclinable to be prepoſſeſſed; and 'twill here fall out, as it almoſt always does in caſes of this nature, that thoſe who pretend to be ſatisfied with what this Libeller ſays, will enquire no further, for fear they ſhould be obliged to alter their Opinion. But without any further Preface, I ſhall take his Libel in pieces, in order as it lies.

SECT.

SECT. I.

The Archbiſhop vindicated from the Charge of not uſing the Word Conſubſtantial.

HE is very angry, That when the Archbiſhop proves our Bleſſed Saviour to be really and truly God, and the Son of God from all Eternity, he do's not uſe the term ὁμοούσιος or *Conſubſtantial*, which was the Teſt of the Catholicks of old, by which they found out the *Arians* with whom they diſputed, who would allow τὸ ὁμοιούσιον, or that the Son was of a *like* Subſtance with the Father, tho they would not allow him to be of the *ſame*. (*a*) "Dr. *Tillotſon* (as he always indecently calls the Archbiſhop) *ſays he*, quotes the words in the "*Nicene* Creed that immediately follow theſe [*Being of the "ſame Subſtance with the Father*], but do's not mention theſe; "which if he had owned, it would have been a more clear "and full Vindication of his Orthodoxy in this Point, than "all theſe four Sermons. And ſince it was impoſſible he "could forget them, when he repeated the ſame Sentence of "the Creed wherein they are contained; we muſt conclude "that he left them out on purpoſe, and conſequently, That "he do's not really believe them, tho he endeavours with all "his art to caſt a Miſt before the Reader's Eyes in other Ex"preſſions, which to ſome might *ſeem tantamount*, as *Arius* "and his Followers did.

(*a*) Charge of Socin. p. 1. col. 2.

Now, if the Archbiſhop do's uſe Expreſſions which are *really tantamount*, then what I have quoted from this Libeller is a Slander, and a malicious Inſinuation, which can ſignify nothing to hurt the Archbiſhop's Memory, ſince it is very well known, that every *Sunday* and *Holiday*, when the *Nicene* Creed was read in the Church, he expreſt his Belief of it, by joyning with the Prieſt that officiated as devoutly as any other Chriſtian in the Aſſembly did.

But this is not all: In theſe very Sermons, the Archbiſhop ſufficiently explains himſelf. (*b*) "All theſe glorious Titles, "[*Word, Life, Light, Fulneſs,*] did really meet in the *Meſſias*, "who

(*b*) Serm 1. p. 16.

"who is the Word; and who before his Incarnation was from "all Eternity with God, partaker of his Divine Nature and "Glory. *Again*, (*c*) "*The ſame was in the beginning with* "*God*; that is, Tho the Word was truly and really God, yet "he was not God the Father, who is the Fountain of the "Deity, but an Emanation from him, the only begotten "Son of God from all Eternity with him; to denote to us, "that which is commonly called by Divines, and for any "thing I could ever ſee properly enough, the diſtinction of "Perſons in the Deity. *Again*, (*d*) "Chriſt was God by "Participation of the Divine Nature and Happineſs together "with the Father, and by way of Derivation from him as "the Light is from the Sun; which is the common Illuſtra- "tion which the Ancient Fathers of the Chriſtian Church "give us of this Myſtery, and is perhaps the beſt and fitteſt "that can be given of it.

(*c*) Serm. 1. p. 23.

(*d*) Serm. 1. p. 36.

Can any words be plainer than theſe, to ſhew that the Archbiſhop really believed the Son to be *Conſubſtantial* with the Father? Could he otherwiſe partake of the Divine Nature? Could it be an Emanation from him, and yet from all Eternity with him any other way? Or, is not Light Conſubſtantial and entirely Coæval too with the Sun? Or when the *Arians* aſſerted that Jeſus Chriſt was *Light of Light*, as ſome of them did in their Expoſitions of Faith, could they poſſibly mean it in a ſtrictly literal Senſe, which manifeſtly ſuppoſes *Conſubſtantiality*? Do they hold the Son of God to be *really Eternal*? There are ſeveral Expoſitions of Faith againſt them in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*; in all which the Catholick Church took eſpecial care to eſtabliſh the *Eternity* of the Son of God, as knowing when that was done, his *Conſubſtantiality with the Father* would neceſſarily follow; *Eternity* being one of the incommunicable Properties or Attributes of the Divine Nature, which cannot be given to any thing that is *made*, let the time of its being *made*, be as Ancient as it will. The *Arians* indeed own'd that Chriſt was before *all Ages*, but that is not owning him to be *Eternal*; they pretended (ſome of them at leaſt) to diſallow that there was a Καιρὸς or Αἰὼν before Chriſt; but they meant by that a *Portion of Time*, or elſe they meant

meant nothing at all by it. Now *Time* is nothing but a *meaſure of Duration*, and ſo there could be no *Time* before ſomething that was capable of Succeſſion was created, which Duration might be meaſured by.

The Archbiſhop was under no obligation to uſe that particular Term, it being no where to be found in Scripture, whoſe Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity he had obliged himſelf to ſet down, and there to reſt. And if our moſt Holy Faith be not a Contention about Words; nay, if it be indifferent how it is explained, provided the Explication be fair, and without fraud; then this Clamour againſt the Archbiſhop is wilfully unjuſt, ſince 'tis made by one that had read over his Sermons, and that knew that he expreſly own'd, That *the Son of God was from all Eternity an Emanation from God the Father, really partaker of the Divine Nature with him*; which words are as plain as words can be, to expreſs what the Catholick Church always believed concerning the Divinity of the Son of God.

The *Socinian Conſiderer* therefore do's the Archbiſhop juſtice in this particular, when he owns him to be a *real Trinitarian*, and accordingly allows him to have a right to alledge particular Texts of Scripture to prove the Divinity of our Saviour in the ſenſe in which 'tis believed by the Catholick Church, which (ſays he) the *Nominal Trinitarians* have no right to do. And 'tis for doing him this Juſtice that this Libeller do's ſo often ſcurrilouſly inſinuate, that the Archbiſhop and the *Socinians* were really reconciled, however outwardly they kept at a diſtance for Form's ſake, to blind thoſe that could not ſee narrowly into things. But of this more hereafter.

And tho here, to do this Libeller right, and that I will do in every thing as near as I can, he is not the only Man that pretends to think ſo, ſince the warm *Charger of Tritheiſm upon Dr.* Sherlock's *Notion of the Trinity* hints the ſame thing, tho covertly, towards the Concluſion of his *Charge*, (*e*) which ſince he knows from theſe Sermons to be a Calumny, he knows alſo (no man better) what the Duty is which lies upon him to take it off.

(*e*) Tritheiſm charged, *&c.* p. 304.

But would this angry Gentleman have given his Rage one minutes time to cool, he would have ſeen, that 'tis morally impoſſible that the *Socinian Conſiderer* could have been ſo far acted by the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*'s *reſtraining Grace* (as he ſpitefully words it) as to fall upon ſome, and paſs by others; when that very Man accuſes the Archbiſhop himſelf of holding the Doctrine of the Trinity, becauſe he was one of the *great Penſioners of the World*; (*f*) that is, in other words, becauſe he was a faithleſs Hypocrite, who profeſſed to believe a Trinity, only becauſe (*g*) *he muſt maintain it*, and durſt do no otherwiſe; which is as vile a reproach upon the Archbiſhop's Memory, as could be ſaid by any mortal Man; nay, and this too was ſaid of the Archbiſhop in print by this *Conſiderer*, whilſt the Archbiſhop was alive. Should the *Charger*'s Inſinuation be true, the Archbiſhop muſt have known Mankind but very indifferently, ſince he could be ſo far impoſed upon as to employ a Man to fall upon ſome particular Perſons for defending the Doctrine of the Trinity, when that very Man whom he thus employ'd, was ready to vent black and virulent Calumnies againſt himſelf for teaching that ſelf-ſame Doctrine, and did within ſome few Months after accordingly vent them.

(*f*) Conſiderations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity by the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, &c. *p.* 44. *col.* 1.

(*g*) Ibid. *p.* 44. *col.* 2.

SECT. II.

The Archbiſhop vindicated from uſing the Word Perſon *ſlightly: With ſome Reflections on the* Animadverter *on the Dean of St.* Paul's.

(*g*) Charge of Socinianiſm, *p.* 3. *col.* 1.

HIS next Charge againſt the Archbiſhop, is, (*g*) "That "he uſes the word *Perſon* very grudgingly and ſlightly, "as brought to it againſt his will, ſo that he cannot con- "ceal his Inclination rather to the diſtinction uſed by the "Anti-Trinitarian Hereticks, to elude thoſe Texts which "ſpeak of the Trinity, which is, that there are three Diffe- "rences in the Deity which are expreſſed in Scripture by the "three

" three Denominations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and " which they allow are ſpoken of after the manner of Perſons, " as *Wiſdom is ſaid to build her Houſe*, &c. But they will not al- " low them to be truly and properly Perſons, or different ſub- " ſiſtences, but only three ſeveral Acceptations of the ſame " Perſon, according to the different manner of his revealing " himſelf upon ſeveral occaſions. And in this ſenſe, and no " other, the Doctor is pleaſed to let the word Perſons paſs, " ſince we muſt have it.

Whether all this be Truth or Calumny, will appear by theſe Paſſages. (*h*) " There are *Three* differences in the Dei- " ty which the Scripture ſpeaks of by the Names of Fa- " ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and every where ſpeaks of " them, as we uſe to do of diſtinct Perſons. And therefore " I ſee no reaſon why in this Argument we ſhould nicely " abſtain from uſing the word Perſon; tho I remember that " St. *Hierom* do's ſomewhere deſire to be excuſed from it. But in his ſingle Sermon *of the Unity of the Divine Nature*, where he is to prove, That (*i*) *the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Tri- nity, or of three real differences or diſtinct Perſons in one and the ſame Divine Nature*, is not inconſiſtent with the Unity of God. Among other things he ſays thus (*k*), " Let it be fur- " ther conſidered, That tho neither the word Trinity, nor " perhaps Perſon, in the ſenſe in which 'tis uſed by Divines " when they treat of this Myſtery, be any where to be met " with in Scripture; yet it cannot be deni'd, but that *Three* " are there ſpoken of by the Names of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy* " *Ghoſt*, in whoſe Name every Chriſtian is baptized, and to " each of whom the higheſt Titles and Properties of God are " in Scripture attributed; and theſe *Three* are ſpoken of with " as much diſtinction from one another, as we uſe to ſpeak " of *Three* ſeveral Perſons. So that tho the word *Trinity* be not " found in Scripture, yet theſe *Three* are there expreſly and " frequently mentioned, and a *Trinity* is nothing but *Three* of " any thing. And ſo likewiſe, tho the word Perſon be not " there expreſly appli'd to *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, yet " it will be very hard to find a more convenient word, where- " by to expreſs the diſtinction of theſe *Three*; for which " reaſon I could never yet ſee any juſt cauſe to quarrel at " this

(*h*) Serm 2. Concerning the Divinity of our B. Saviour, *p.* 120.

(*i*) Sermon. Concerning the Unity of the Divine Nature, *p.* 25.

(*k*) Ibid. *p.* 31, 32, 33.

"this Term. For ſince the Holy Spirit of God in Scripture "hath thought fit in ſpeaking of theſe *Three* to diſtinguiſh "them from one another, as we uſe in common ſpeech to "diſtinguiſh *Three* ſeveral Perſons; I cannot ſee any reaſon "why in the Explication of this Myſtery, which purely de- "pends upon Divine Revelation, we ſhould not ſpeak of it "in the ſame manner as the Scripture doth. And tho the "word Perſon is now become a *Term of Art*, I ſee no cauſe "why we ſhould decline it, ſo long as we mean by it nei- "ther more nor leſs than what the Scripture ſays in other "words.

Can the Archbiſhop now be ſaid to uſe the word *Perſon grudgingly* or *ſlightly*, or *againſt his Will*, when he ſtands up in defence of it? Can any Man ſay without ſlandering him, that he (*l*) *will not too nicely abſtain from the word Perſon, or any other word, ſince he can make it ſignify what he pleaſes, only a difference, or a ſomewhat, or a no-what, by a Mental Reſervation, tho he knows thoſe he diſputes with, and thoſe he ſpeaks to, take it in another Senſe?* Or can any Man that but pretends to Integrity and Honeſty, ſay, That the Archbiſhop (*m*) *oppoſes the Doctrine of the Trinity as taught by Divines?* How, or where do's he (*n*) *peremptorily determine* againſt the Senſe of Divines as Anti-Scriptural? Or becauſe the Archbiſhop has aſſerted that (*o*) *no ſuch word* as *Perſon* is to be found in Scripture, in the ſenſe in which it is uſed by Divines, what reaſon is there from thence to inſinuate that the Archbiſhop ſhould affirm that there is (*p*) *no ſuch Thing as Perſon* to be found in Scripture, when it is uſed of the Trinity? *Things* it ſeems, and *Words*, with our Libeller, ſignify both alike.

(*l*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 3. *col.* 2.

(*m*) Ibid *p.* 13. *col.* 1.

(*n*) Ibid. *p.* 13. *col.* 1.

(*o*) Sermon. Unity of Divine Nature, *p.* 31, 32.

(*p*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 13. *col.* 2.

But he will ſay, perhaps, That he do's not here examine this laſt Paſſage out of the Archbiſhop's Sermon *of the Unity of the Divine Nature*, but only that out of his Second Sermon, *concerning the Divinity of our Bleſſed Saviour*; and there (ſays he) Dr. *Tillotſon* ſeems unwilling to admit the word Perſon. Why pray? becauſe St. *Hierom* ſomewhere deſires to be excuſed from it. (*q*) *This ſomewhere of St.* Hierom's *is* (in our Libeller's Opinion) *a ſtrange Quotation for ſo grave a Doctor to bring into the Pulpit upon ſo ſerious a Subject, if he thought it ſo.*

(*q*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 3. *col.* 2.

Whatſoever

Whatſoever he thinks, for my part I can ſee no lightneſs in it, nothing being more common than to ſay, that any Author ſays a thing *ſomewhere*, when he that quotes him do's not think it neceſſary to produce the place, as here 'tis evident it was not.

When St. *Paul* quoted *Aratus* to the *Athenians*, he produces the place without ſo much as naming the Author from whom he takes it. (*r*) *As certain alſo of your own Poets have ſaid*; and juſt ſo he quotes *Epimenides* to *Titus* (*s*). That's a ſtranger way of quoting than the Archbiſhop's, ſince there is neither Author nor Book named, and yet the Apoſtle produces both thoſe Paſſages, to give weight to what he was then to ſay to the *Athenians*, and to *Titus*.

(*r*) Acts 17. 28.

(*s*) Tit. 1. 12.

Yet this excuſe, ſhould it be made, is not ſufficient. This Libeller had read the Archbiſhop's Sermon *of the Unity of the Divine Nature*, before his Libel was ſent to the Preſs; for he ſays in his Preface, That his *Animadverſions* (as he calls them) were written before the Archbiſhop's Death. If ſo, he ought to allow the Archbiſhop that Juſtice which all Men mutually give and take as their undoubted Right, to interpret one place of his Works by another, if there is not a manifeſt Contradiction; and conſequently, ſuppoſing that in the former Paſſage the Archbiſhop may be thought to ſeem unwilling to uſe the word *Perſon* of the *Bleſſed Three* in the Trinity; yet that cannot be his meaning, becauſe in the later Paſſage he not only allows, but urges Arguments why other People ought not to lay it aſide, and ſuch Arguments too as plainly prove him, in the *Socinian Conſiderer*'s Language, a *real Trinitarian*, and yet no *Tritheiſt*.

But this is not all that I have to ſay concerning this Cavil; (for Objection it is none.) It is plain, that inſtead of being unwilling to uſe the word *Perſon*, the Archbiſhop brings Reaſons why it ought to be uſed; and after his particular way, equally compounded of good Nature, and good Breeding, gently reproves thoſe who *nicely abſtain* from a Term which had been for ſo many Ages uſed in the Catholick Church. And by them he do's in all probability mean ſome very Eminent Perſons in the Church, who had not long before taken much pains to vindicate the Doctrine of the Trinity,

Trinity, and the Incarnation, from the Objections and Cavils of the *Socinians*. Theſe Learned Men were for ſubſtituting other words inſtead of thoſe *Terms of Art* by which the Church was accuſtomed to repreſent its Conceptions concerning theſe great Myſteries, for which they have been ſeverely handled by ſome warm Animadverters. Our good Archbiſhop, who always reproved in the Spirit of Meekneſs, when he ſaw that thoſe who took a wrong courſe, did it out of a good deſign, thought his mild way the beſt, and the moſt effectual to ſhew his ſenſe of this matter. But why then (will it be ſaid) do's our Libeller calumniate the Archbiſhop, as if he had neglected that very thing which he ſees he did? Even becauſe he do's not fall upon thoſe who had offered ſome new Terms, as ſome others had done juſt before. This was offence enough to our Libeller. The Archbiſhop gives his Opinion ſoftly, like a Friend, like a Chriſtian, and like a Father of the Church; even ſo, as tho the Perſons concerned could not but take it to themſelves, yet at the ſame time they muſt ſee that it was ſaid in Love, as all Reproofs ought to be.

But alas! this would not do ſome Mens buſineſs: The Dean of St. *Paul*'s happened to be one of thoſe Eminent Men who had affirmed, That the uſe of theſe *Terms of Art*, and *Perſon* amongſt the reſt, had *very much obſcured the Doctrine of the Trinity, inſtead of explaining it* (*t*). Now he having incurred the Diſpleaſure of the *Jacobites*, for reaſons very well known to the whole Nation, they were willing he ſhould be repreſented to the World as a Prevaricator, a Corrupter of the Faith, a Blaſphemer, and what not? Thoſe that did thus repreſent him, *Jacobites* or not, were highly approved of; whereas thoſe who gently excuſed what they did not very well like, were to be repreſented as *Socinians* themſelves for ſo doing. And this is the true reaſon of this Calumny; for the Archbiſhop had plainly declared (*u*) that he was not afraid to own, that other Men might *very commendably attempt a more particular Explication of this great Myſtery, tho he durſt not pretend to it, as knowing both the difficulty and the danger of ſuch an attempt.*

(*t*) Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, *p.* 101.

(*u*) Serm. Of Unity of Divine Nature, *p.* 29.

This

This one would have thought might have been a warning to the *Animadverter upon the Dean of St.* Pauls, how he had uſed ſo much ſharpneſs in his Writings againſt him, for fear the World ſhould have ſuſpected that it was a perſonal Pique, more than Love of the Truth, that ſet him on firſt, and ſharpned his Pen afterwards. For tho a man's *meaning* ſhould be never ſo unbiaſs'd, yet if he gives occaſion to the World to imagine otherwiſe, thoſe that are convinced by his Reaſons, may be tempted to deſpiſe his Perſon, which would be a very mortifying Conſideration to Men of ſome Tempers, if they could once be brought to believe it. There are ſeveral things which may blind the Eyes of the Wiſe, beſides a Gift; and when they are ſo blinded, they may be led, ere they are aware, to do the buſineſs of thoſe, who tho they at preſent ſpeak them fair, and commend their Learning and Acuteneſs, yet at the bottom will eſteem them but as Tools, and would uſe them as ſuch, if they preſuming upon their Services, ſhould contradict theſe their Applauders in any matter of moment.

What I have here ſaid, is no Digreſſion from my general Deſign, which is to reſcue Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s Memory out of the hands of thoſe who delight to blacken it. And the Animadverter upon the Dean of St. *Pauls* has ſhewn too great a ſharpneſs towards the Archbiſhop, up and down in his Writings, not to be taken notice of. I declare (to ſpeak in his own Language) that I fear him as little as he do's Dr. *Sherlock*, and ſhould reverence him as much as I fear him little, if he had ſhew'd a Temper equal to his Learning and Skill in winding and wreſting an Argument, which laſt indeed is very extraordinary. I know but one uſe that can reſult from ſuch a way of handling of an Adverſary, which is, that it may frighten Men from going never ſo little out of the common Road, leſt they ſhould fall into ſuch hands, and ſo keep their Thoughts to themſelves till they have been carefully and impartially ſcanned by indifferent Perſons.

But that I may diſpatch what I have to ſay to the Animadverter upon Dr. *Sherlock* all at once, I ſhall remind him of a very true Aſſertion of his own, namely, (*w*) *That of all*

(*w*) Animadverſions, *p.* 348.

all Men living, ſuch as will be Writers, eſpicially provoking inſulting Writers, are concerned to tread tenderly, and to take every ſtep with the utmoſt Caution, where they do not find a Grammatical Bottom firm under them. Accordingly I demand of him who (*x*) *is a Grecian in his heart*, what he meant by finding fault with the Dean of St. *Paul*'s (*y*) *Lucifer Caralitanus*? Do's not he know that Κάραλις and Κάραλοι in *Greek*, and *Caralis* in *Latin*, were received Names of *Cagliari* or *Calaris*, as it is moſt uſually called? *Henricus Valeſius* (who perhaps underſtood *Greek* as well as that young Gentleman of *Weſtminſter*-School whom the Animadverter employ'd to examine the Accents of the *Greek* Citations in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Vindication) tranſlates theſe words of *Socrates* (*z*), Λούκιφερ Καράλων Ἐπίσκοπος, ἥ ἐστι πόλις Σαρδανίας, thus, *Lucifer Caralis, quæ Urbs eſt Sardiniæ, erat Epiſcopus* (*a*); and in his Index calls him, *Lucifer Caralitanus*; and ſo do's Dr. *Cave*, *v. Lucifer*, in his *Hiſtoria Literaria*. If their Verdict is excepted againſt as Modern Writers, St. *Hierom*'s ſure will paſs in this caſe, (tho not for the ſignification of the word *Hypoſtaſis*) who calls him *Caralitanus* in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and concludes his Account of him with theſe words, *Sub Juliano Principe Caralis reverſus, Valentiniano regnante obiit.*

(*x*) Ibid. *p.* 332.

(*y*) Ibid. *p.* 335.

(*z*) Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 3. *cap.* 5.

(*a*) *Chriſtopherſon* alſo, who was a very Learned Man, tranſlates them thus, *Lucifer Caralorum, Urbis Sardiniæ, fuit Epiſcopus.*

The Dean's (*b*) *then* for *than* is not ſo mortal a fault as this new *Ariſtarchus* imagines. The Tranſlators of the Bible, and the Compoſers of our Liturgy knew no difference in the ſpelling of theſe two words; nor do any Editions of the Bible and Liturgy, which I have conſulted, make any alteration to this day. So that tho for theſe laſt forty or fifty years the Printers have commonly diſtinguiſht the Adverb of Time from the Note of Compariſon by the variation of the Vowel; yet, ſince it was not anciently or but rarely practiſed, a Man cannot be accuſed of writing ungrammatically that do's not obſerve their Diſtinction: And this our Animadverter, who is againſt the (*c*) *uſeful Philoſophy of Alterations*, ſhould a little have conſidered before he had taxed the Dean with writing falſe *Engliſh* upon this account. Moreover, that he may not meaſure me by himſelf,

(*b*) Animad. *p.* 341.

(*c*) Preſat. *p.* 14.

ſelf, and imagine that I take him up, as he does the Dean of St. *Pauls*, only for the pleaſure of expoſing him, I ſhall direct him to an Author, whoſe Authority in matters of this kind, will go full as far as his own, and that is the Biſhop of *Rocheſter*, who in his admirable *Hiſtory of the Royal Society* uſually writes *then* for *than*, as knowing that the new way of writing that word, had not gained ſufficient Authority to be always allow'd in a Book, which was deſigned to be (as it moſt certainly will) a pattern to Poſterity how they ſhould write elegantly and exactly upon Philoſophical Subjects.

Some of the Animadverter's Friends deſire to know what he means by the word *Pre-heminence*; it cannot (ſay they) be miſtaken for *Pre-eminence*, becauſe that comes from the *Latin* word *Præeminere*, which has no *h* in the middle of it.

But ſince this Gentleman, by playing the Pedant with the Dean of St. *Pauls*, has encouraged others to do the like with him, without incurring the ſuſpicion of being Pedants themſelves, I ſhall put him in mind of a thing he is often guilty of, and that is, of altering of parts of Speech againſt the Analogy of his own Language; and that he almoſt always does in a Word, which methinks he ſhould be intimately well acquainted with, *viz. Write.* This Verb is thus formed, *write*, *wrote*, *written*, or *writ.* So that the Preterperfect Tenſe, *wrote*, is never to be promiſcuouſly uſed for the Paſſive Participle *written* or *writ.* And yet the *Animadverter*, and his Friend the *Charger* do generally ſay, *have been wrote*, *is wrote*, *ſeem wrote*, and the like; for *have been written*, *is written*, *ſeem written*, which in *Latin* would run thus, *fuere ſcripſit*, *eſt ſcripſit*, *videntur ſcripſit*; in which Language his Friends at *Weſtminſter*-School know ſuch ſort of Conſtructions to be very elegant. *Wrote* and *written* are never (as I believe) miſtaken each for the other in the *Engliſh* Bible, nor Liturgy; which Books, may for the Grammatical Conſtructions of Nouns and Verbs be appealed to as Standards of our Language in moſt Caſes. He commits the like overſight in the words *undertook* and *miſtook*, which are only the Preter-

perfect-Tenſes of the Verbs *undertake* and *miſtake*, which he uſes participially for *undertaken* and *miſtaken*. For, *I have undertook*, is not more Elegant than *I have took*, which every Man at firſt view ſees to be falſe *Engliſh*.

But the *Charger* is not only miſtaken in the Uſe of words, but ſometimes he faulters in the Conſtructions of his Sentences. Let him make *Engliſh* of theſe words: (*d*) *For as much as the Conſequent may indeed infer and prove both the Being and Unity of the Antecedent, but cauſe or give it, it neither do's nor can.* Nothing anſwers here to *as much as*. But as he in kindneſs to the Dean of St. *Pauls* puts his Arguments into form for him, when he pretends that the Dean cannot do it himſelf; ſo I ſhall make *Engliſh* of his Sentence, becauſe he did not do it himſelf. *For tho the Conſequent may indeed infer and prove both the Being and Unity of the Antecedent, yet cauſe or give it, it neither does nor can.* And now I appeal to the *Animadverter*, if this be not what the *Charger of Tritheiſm upon Dr.* Sherlock ought to have ſaid, if he had intended to ſpeak either *Engliſh*, or Senſe.

(*d*) Tritheiſm charged, *p.* 99.

Within three Pages of this Elegant Sentence, (*e*) the Charger tells the Dean of St. *Pauls*, That what he ſays of the Principle of Self-Conſciouſneſs is *newly and poſtliminiouſly thruſt in*; which word *poſtliminiouſly*, as he uſes it, is (to ſpeak in his own Stile) downright Nonſence, according to the *Animadverter*'s account of that word. (*f*) The *Latin* word *Poſtliminium*, from whence this Adverb *poſtliminiouſly* is derived, ſignifies the return of a Priſoner out of Captivity; and the *jus Poſtlimimii* was that right, by which, according to the *Roman* Law, every Citizen of *Rome* upon his return out of Captivity re-enter'd upon all the Poſſeſſions, and enjoy'd all the Priviledges which he had a right to poſſeſs and enjoy before he was taken Captive by his Enemies; ſo that not only *to thruſt in poſtliminiouſly*, is very near Nonſence, ſince a Man cannot well be ſaid to be *thruſt* into his old Poſſeſſions, from which he had been kept back by force; Men being generally willing in ſuch Caſes to get home again as ſoon as they can; but the word *poſtliminiouſly* as it is

(*e*) Ibid. *p.* 102. *l.* 19.

(*f*) Animad. *p.* 367, *&c.*

joyn'd

joyn'd with *newly*, makes a contradiction; it being impoſſible for any one thing to be *new* and *poſtliminious* at the ſame time.

The new Philoſophers think that the *Charger* has aſſerted as abſurd a thing in Philoſophy, as ever the Dean of St. *Pauls* aſſerted in Divinity, when he maintains (*g*), that *an Image by Reflection is an Emanation from the Prototype or Exemplar, from which the* Species ſenſibiles *iſſue or proceed*; they can eaſily underſtand how the Rays of Light which are reflected from all Bodies by Angles equal to the Angles of Incidence, ſhould conſequently repreſent the true Figure of the Bodies from which they are reflected, to the Eye upon which they fall after that Reflection; but as for real Emanations from the Bodies themſelves, thoſe they do with very good reaſon laugh at, and (I had almoſt ſaid) at thoſe too who at this time of day aſſert them.

(*g*) Trith. charged, *p.* 73, 74.

When the *Charger* bids the Dean of St. *Pauls* (*h*) anſwer *Picus Mirandula*'s Letter to *Hermolaus Barbarus*, in defence of the Schoolmen and their Terms; he banters his Reader under a pretence of expoſing Dr. *Sherlock*. *Hermolaus Barbarus* was not unacquainted with the Schoolmens way of handling Philoſophical Subjects, and conſequently if he did deſpiſe and ſcoff at it, it could not be upon that account. *Hermolaus Barbarus* was one of the greateſt Philoſophers of that Age. He tranſlated *Ariſtotle*'s *Logical Tracts*, and *Themiſtius*'s *Paraphraſe* upon his *Poſterior Analytics*, into *Latin* with ſo great applauſe, that *Picus* himſelf thought it worth while to imitate them, for which mark of his eſteem *Hermolaus* thanks him (*i*) in the Letter that precedes this which our Charger alludes to, in *Politian*'s Collection. In ſhort, *Hermolaus* was one of the Learnedeſt Men of his Age in all manner of Ancient Learning. Such a Man ſo throughly verſed in the *Ariſtotelian* Philoſophy, could not deſpiſe *Terms of Art*, as *ſuch*, tho he juſtly might as *Barbarous*, when truly proper *Latin* ones might have been ſubſtituted in their place. This was the real State of the Controverſy between theſe two very Learned Men, as appears by *Picus*'s Letter, and *Barbarus*'s Reply, both printed by

(*h*) Ibid. *p.* 84.

(*i*) Politian. Epiſt. Lib. ix. Ep. 3.

by *Politian* in the ſame place. For which reaſon a Man who is ſaid to have been for many Years Publick Orator of a very renowned Univerſity, ſhould (one would think) have been cautious how he had miſrepreſented one of the greateſt Maſterpieces of Modern Oratory any where extant, had it been only out of reſpect to his old Profeſſion.

I have taken no notice of the Scholaſtical part of this Man's Writings: That Learned Gentleman, who has undertaken to account with him for them, is ſo very well able to do it as it ought to be done, that it would be preſumption in me to attempt to take any part of his Work out of his hand. The Animadverter cannot reaſonably complain at any Man's Severity, who by his *Iſhmaelitiſh* way of Writing has alarmed all that are, or ever intend to be Authors. He, *whoſe hand is againſt every Man*, may juſtly expect *that every Man's hand ſhould be againſt him*; and he that arraigns Dr. *Sherlock* for faults that the Learnedeſt and Carefulleſt Writers in the World might have been arraigned for as well as he, ſince they are chargeable only upon the Printers, who in *England* are nor over-correct, opens a way (if ſuch ſort of Accuſations ſhould take place) to deſtroy the Credit of the moſt uſeful Books we have, and to frighten every modeſt Man from publiſhing his Compoſures, when for ought he knows, ſuch barbarous Uſage as our Animadverter beſtows upon his Antagoniſts, is all the requital that he ſhall have for his pains. But it is time to return to our Libeller.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Archbiſhop's Expoſition of Phil. 2. 5. *Vindicated.*

HE ſays that the Archbiſhop under a pretence of producing that paſſage, *Phil.* 2. 5. againſt the *Socinians* (*k*), has interpreted it after their manner, and thereby eluded a very ſtrong Argument for the Divinity of Chriſt, and ſubſtituted a very weak one in its room; which (ſays this Libeller) is a very effectual method to deſtroy any Cauſe whatſoever.

(*k*) Charge of Socinianiſm, *p.* 4. *col.* 1.

The Archbiſhop's words are theſe, (*l*) "And that he was "not only *with God*, before he aſſumed Humane Nature, "but alſo was really God, St. *Paul* tells us, *Let this mind be* "*in you, which was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus, who being in the Form* "*of God,* οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, *did not arrogate to himſelf to be* "*equal with God*, that is, he made no Oſtentation of his "Divinity: For this I take to be the true meaning of that "Phraſe, both becauſe it is ſo uſed by *Plutarch*, and becauſe "it makes the Senſe much more eaſy and current, thus, *who* "*being in the Form of God, did not aſſume an Equality with God*, "that is, he did not appear in the Glory of his Divinity, "which was hid under a Veil of Humane Fleſh and Infirmity. "*But he emptied himſelf, and took upon him the form of a Ser-* "*vant*, &c.

(*l*) Serm. 2. *p.* 90, 91.

Hereupon our Libeller exclaims at a high rate: (*m*) "St. "*Paul*'s words are, *Who being in the Form of God, thought it* "*not Robbery to be equal with God.* But inſtead of, *He thought* "*it not Robbery*, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, the Doctor would have "the ſenſe to be, *He did not arrogate to himſelf to be equal* "*with God*; tho it is quite contrary to the words which are "literally tranſlated. *He thought it not Robbery, i. e.* he did "make himſelf equal. *He did not arrogate to himſelf to be* "*equal, i. e.* He did not make himſelf equal. Senſes, which "are in terms oppoſite. *He did*, ſays the Text. *He did not*, "ſays

(*m*) Charge of Socinian. *p.* 3. *col.* 2. *p.* 4. *col.* 1.

"ſays the Doctor. This is the impudent Anſwer which the "*Brief Hiſtory* of the *Unitarians* gives to this Text, and which "the Doctor here recommends. And he ſays, That that "Phraſe is uſed ſo by *Plutarch*; but he names not the words, "nor quotes the place, which he would have done, if he had "thought it for his purpoſe. For he cannot deny, that the "words are rightly tranſlated, and they cannot bear two op-"poſite Senſes.

Now, whether this Libeller be more guilty of ſlandering, or the Archbiſhop of prevaricating and miſinterpreting the words of Scripture, let *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* judge. *Grotius* muſt be allow'd a competent Judge, becauſe our Libeller acquits him of *Socinianiſm* in the very beginning of his Libel; and as for Dr. *Hammond* no Man ever yet charged him with it, either directly or by conſequence.

Grotius's Interpretation is this. (*n*) "Ἁρπαγμὸν "ἡγεῖσζ *eſt locutio Syriaca. In Liturgia Syriaca* (*o*) "*Johannes Baptiſta, Chriſto Baptiſmum ab ipſa expe-*"*tenti dicit,* לא אלכוך גוזלתא, lo elbuk guzaltho, "non aſſumam rapinam. *Solent qui aliquid bel-*"*lica virtute peperere id omnibus oſtentare, ut Ro-*"*mani in triumpho faccre ſolebant. Non multo ali-*"*ter Plutarchus in Timoleonte* οὐκ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο. "*Senſus eſt* non venditavit Chriſtus, non jactavit "iſtam poteſtatem, *quin ſæpe etiam imperavit, ne quod fecerat* "*vulgaretur.*

(*n*) In locum.

(*o*) The Liturgy which *Grotius* quotes, is an Office of Baptiſm compoſed by *Severus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and printed by *Guido Fabricius Buderianus* at *Antwerp* in *Plantin*'s Preſs, in 1572.

This Interpretation of theſe words, which is the ſame with our Archbiſhop's, and from whence he might perhaps firſt have taken it, is contradicted by Dr. *Hammond*, but not becauſe it favours *Socinianiſm*, but becauſe in his Opinion it is not warrantable by the *Greek* Text. What he ſays to juſtify it as not favouring *Socinianiſm*, being very much to the preſent purpoſe, I ſhall tranſcribe, both becauſe it ſtrengthens the Archbiſhop's Interpretation, and becauſe afterwards when he endeavours to overthrow it, he takes no notice of the words of *Plutarch*, which as one of *Grotius*'s ſtrongeſt Arguments, are only taken notice of by Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*.

Dr.

Dr. *Hammond*'s words are theſe, (*p*) "This [namely "that μορφὴ ſignifies the real Eſſence of the thing here "ſpoken of] being thus evident of this firſt Phraſe, ἐν μορφῇ "Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, where Chriſts Divinity is aſſerted, and that "precedaneous to his Humiliation, and as the *Terminus* "*à quo*, the term of Elevation, *from which* his Exinanition "and Humiliation takes its riſe, and is much encreaſed "thereby, there would now be little gained to the Cauſe "of the *Photinians* or *Arians*, in caſe the Phraſe that fol- "lows, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα τῷ Θεῷ, which we ren- "der, *thought it no Robbery to be equal with God*, ſhould "appear to be miſtaken. For when it is once acknowledged "that Chriſt was God before his Aſſumption of our Hu- "man Nature, and that being really God, or ὑπάρχων *ſubſiſting* "in the real Form of God, he took our Humane Nature "upon him; it is by neceſſary conſequence concluded, that "he is equal with God, which is all that is pretended by "any from this ſecond Phraſe. For as to them that affirm "Chriſt a *Deus factus*, a God that had a beginning of be- "ing ſo, and from thence deny his equality with the Fa- "ther; it is evident that they date his Divinity from his "Reſurrection and Exaltation, (which is manifeſtly con- "futed by his being God before his Humiliation) and they "that affirm him ὁμοιούσιον of *like* (but not ὁμούσιον of the *ſame*) "*being* with the Father, are ſufficiently confuted by the "Notion of μορφὴ here ſet down, as it ſignifies the real "Being of God, wherein he was ὑπάρχων, *ſubſiſting*; for "that includes Equality, and not Likeneſs only. Now, "for the Phraſe οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα τῷ Θεῷ, that "it ſhould ſignify *Chriſt's not aſſuming to appear like God*; or "*ſpectari tanquam Deum, to be looked on as God*, and ſo be- "long to his forbidding many times to have his Power "and Divine Greatneſs proclaimed; there is but one Ar- "gument, which to me makes it any thing probable, (and "that not taken notice of by them that defend that ſenſe) "and that taken from the ἀλλὰ, *but*, which follows *v.* 7. "For in this notion of the Phraſe, it would moſt commo- "diouſly agree with that, *he would not aſſume* or *own* ſo "much Greatneſs, but *humbled* or *emptied* himſelf, &c.

(*p*) *In locum.*

" where that *aſſuming*, and that *humbling*, are directly oppo-
" ſite, and ſo moſt agreeable to the importance of ἀλλὰ,
" *but*, a note of Oppoſition. And indeed this notion of
" the Phraſe would very well connect it to the Antecedents,
" thus, *he being in Form*, &c. *i. e.* truly and eternally God,
" when he came down on Earth, would not thus aſſume
" and magnify his Power, but, ἐκένωσε, *diminiſhed*, or *leſſened*,
" and *humbled* himſelf; asked at one time, *why calleſt thou*
" *me good? none is good ſave God*; and at another, command-
" ed that his Miracles which demonſtrated him to be God,
" ſhould not be divulged. And this Notion conſiſts very well
" with the Context, and the Aſſertion of Chriſt's Divinity;
" for being God, he might yet chuſe to conceal his be-
" ing ſo.

I leave it now to the Conſcience of this ſhameleſs Scribler, if it be not quite ſeared, whether his charging the Archbiſhop with *recommending the Impudent Anſwer, which the* Unitarian *Hiſtorian gives to this Text*, be not an Impudent Calumny. For tho I have never conſulted that *Socinian* Pamphlet, yet I am ſure its Author can never interpret this Text as the Archbiſhop interprets it after *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*, unleſs he will give up his Cauſe. Now it was ſaid long ago by him, who was Truth it ſelf, that *if Satan be divided againſt himſelf* (that is, if a *Socinian* brings ſolid Arguments to prove Jeſus Chriſt to be *God by Nature*, as well as *Man*) *his Kingdom cannot ſtand.*

SECT. IV.

The Charge about our Saviour's Satisfaction, *and* Hell-Torments, *Anſwered.*

(q) Charge, &c. p. 4. col. 1.

THE Archbiſhop is accuſed of *rank Socinianiſm* (q) by this Libeller, becauſe he names but once the word *Satisfaction* in his four Sermons, *Concerning the Divinity of our Bleſſed Saviour.* He pretends, indeed, to ground his Charge upon

upon a Sermon preached by the Archbiſhop at *Whitehall* in the Year 1689. upon *Matth.* 25. 46. wherein (*r*) he makes the Archbiſhop aſſert, "That there is no certainty of Hell-"Torments, becauſe there was no need of any Satisfacti-"on to God's Juſtice at all; and that God's Juſtice is to be "conſidered no otherwiſe than as a Politique to ſecure his "Government, and therefore do's not infer any Puniſh-"ment of Sinners; but that his Threats may be only "*in Terrorem*, or ſo far to be inflicted, as may ſecure his "Government from the Rebellion and Uſurpation of wick-"ed Men. From all which he ironically concludes with theſe words, *As if God were afraid of being depoſed by them.*

(*r*) Ibid.

This Accuſation relating to the four Sermons by themſelves, and to that other Sermon by its ſelf, (upon which our Libeller mentions ſome Animadverſions of his own, which I have never ſeen) which he calls a *helliſh one* in another place, ſhall be diſtinctly conſidered. In his third Sermon Archbiſhop *Tillotſon* ſays thus (*s*), "By aſſuming our frail and mor-"tal Nature, he [the Son of God] became capable of ſuffer-"ing, and of ſhedding his precious Blood for us, and by that "means of *purchaſing forgiveneſs of Sins*, and *eternal Redemption* "for us. And again (*t*), The Son of God took our Nature "upon him, that by his bitter Paſſion he might make Expia-"tion for Sin.

(*s*) Serm. 3. *p.* 155, 156.

(*t*) Ibid. *p.* 166.

That theſe two Paſſages are directly levelled againſt the *Socinian Doctrine*, which *denies the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt*, is moſt manifeſt. What does *purchaſing forgiveneſs of Sins and eternal Redemption* ſignify, but only that God would not forgive Sin *freely*? And why not? but only to *ſatisfy* his Juſtice? Is not this the proper notion of an *Expiatory Sacrifice*, that thereby the Anger of God is appeaſed, and his Wrath turned away from us? Can this Libeller pretend that he did not read theſe Paſſages? That would be ſtrange, ſince he could ſay that the word *Satisfaction* occurs but once in all theſe Sermons. Did he not underſtand their meaning? Perfectly well; but if he had owned that he had obſerved them, it would have confuted his Calumny, and deſtroy'd his Deſign. The Chriſtian Religion, it ſeems,

according to this man's new Divinity, lies not in *Things* and *Propoſitions*, in *Doctrines* and *Precepts*, but in *Words* and *Names*; ſo that tho the Articles of Religion be never ſo ſolidly proved, yet if ſome particular words be alſo made uſe of, all will not do. Our Libeller pretends to think that gives him a right to blacken and calumniate thoſe upon whom he can faſten this neglect (as he calls it) in the fouleſt manner poſſible, provided that upon other accounts they have incurred his diſpleaſure.

What he ſays of the Archbiſhop's Sermon of *Hell-Torments* is equally calumnious. The Archbiſhop no where ſays directly or indirectly through that whole Diſcourſe, *That there is no certainty of Hell*; and much leſs upon this reaſon, *Becauſe there is no need of any Satisfaction to God's Juſtice.* He proves that the words *for ever* and *everlaſting*, when applied to the Miſeries of the damned after Death, are to be taken in a literal Senſe. For tho they do not always in Scripture ſignify an endleſs Duration; (*u*) "yet ſince the "very ſame Words and Expreſſions are uſed concerning the "duration of the puniſhment of wicked Men in another "Life, that are uſed concerning the eternal Happineſs of "good Men in another Life; there is great reaſon why we "ſhould underſtand them in the ſame extent: Both becauſe "if God had intended to have told us, that the puniſh-"ment of wicked Men ſhall have no end; the Languages "wherein the Scriptures are written, do hardly afford ful-"ler and more certain words, than thoſe that are uſed in "this caſe, whereby to expreſs to us a duration without end; "and likewiſe, which is almoſt a peremptory deciſion of the "thing, becauſe the duration of the puniſhment of wicked "Men is in the very ſame Sentence expreſſed by the very "ſame word which is uſed for the Duration of the Happi-"neſs of the Righteous. As is evident from the Text, *Theſe*, "ſpeaking of the wicked, *ſhall go*, εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, into eter-"nal Puniſhment, but the righteous, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, into "Life eternal.

(*w*) Page 6. Edit. 4to.

And whereas this Libeller charges the Archbiſhop with ſaying, *That God's Juſtice is to be conſidered no otherwiſe than as a Politique to ſecure his Government, and therefore does not infer*

infer any Puniſhment of Sinners; the Archbiſhop teaches the quite contrary in theſe words, (*w*) "Juſtice indeed is concerned, "that the Righteous and the Wicked ſhould not be treated "alike; and farther yet, that greater Sins ſhould have a hea- "vier puniſhment, and that mighty Sinners ſhould be migh- "tily tormented. (*w*) Page 12.

Why then all this Clamour? Becauſe the Archbiſhop aſ- ſerts in the very next words, "That all this may be conſi- "dered and adjuſted in the degree and the intenſeneſs of the "ſuffering, without making any difference in the duration "of it; Purſuant to a very true Propoſition which he had laid down juſt above, "That the appointing and appor- "tioning of Penalties to Crimes, is not ſo properly a conſi- "deration of Juſtice as of Prudence in a Lawgiver. Which Propoſition was advanced to vindicate the Juſtice of God from the Objections of thoſe who find fault with the *Diſpro- portion that there is between temporary Sins, and eternal Puniſh- ments.*

But the Archbiſhop's Notion of Threatnings in general has been moſt laid hold of to faſten all theſe Calumnies upon him. Now his Notion of Threatning is this, (*x*) "He that threatens, keeps the right of puniſhing in his "own hand, and is not obliged to execute what he hath "threatned any farther than the Reaſons and Ends of Go- "verment do require. And he may without any injury to "the Party threatned, remit and abate as much as he "pleaſeth of the puniſhment that he hath threatned. This is abſolutely true, and neceſſarily conſequent upon that Idea of Threatnings which all Mankind have, and by which they conſtantly act. (*x*) Page 13.

Now becauſe the Archbiſhop had affirm'd all this in the general, and from hence among other reaſons ſhewn, that it is not inconſiſtent with the Juſtice of God *to threaten* to puniſh Sins which were ſoon committed, with a very laſt- ing, nay, an eternal Puniſhment; therefore this Libeller infers, That the Archbiſhop *actually taught* that Hell-Torments are inflicted only *in Terrorem*; which is unjuſt to the laſt de- gree.

Nay,

Nay, ſo far was the Archbiſhop from drawing this particular Concluſion from thoſe general premiſes, which this Scribler charges him with, that after he has proved that God's Oath to Sinners, That they ſhould never enter into his Reſt, can in the plain ſenſe of the words be extended no farther than to the Excluſion of Impenitent Sinners out of Heaven, and their falling finally ſhort of the Reſt and Happineſs of the righteous; he ſubjoyns theſe words, (*y*) "That we are to "conſider that both the Tenor of the Sentence which our "Bleſſed Saviour hath aſſured us will be paſſed upon them at "the Judgement of the Great Day, *Depart ye curſed into ever-*"*laſting Fire*; and likewiſe this Declaration in the Text, "That the wicked ſhall go away into everlaſting Puniſhment, "tho they do not reſtrain God from doing what he pleaſes, "yet they cut off from the Sinner all reaſonable hopes of "the Relaxation or Mitigation of them. For ſince the great "Judge of the World hath made ſo plain and expreſs a De-"claration, and will certainly paſs ſuch a Sentence, it would "be the greateſt folly and madneſs in the World for the Sin-"ner to entertain any hope of eſcaping it, and to venture his "Soul upon that hope.

(*y*) Page 15.

Theſe are the Archbiſhop's expreſs words, from whence (in my opinion) it manifeſtly follows, that this Libeller calumniates; what he ſays, is directly contrary not only to what the Archbiſhop affirms, but proves. This every Reader, who will but read over that Sermon, muſt plainly ſee; and indeed, it ought to be read and ſtudy'd upon other accounts, beſides that of vindicating Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s Memory, it being one of the moſt rational, and moſt pathetical Exhortations to fly from Sin here, that we may avoid eternal Miſery hereafter, which is any where extant in our Language.

SECT.

SECT. V.

The Charge diſproved of the Archbiſhop's advancing a Barbarous, Abſurd, and Blaſphemous Notion of the Chriſtian Religion.

THE next Charge againſt the Archbiſhop, is, That he has advanced (z) *a moſt Barbarous, Abſurd, and Blaſphemous Notion of the Chriſtian Religion.* This is faſtned upon him for the reaſons which he gives, why God may be ſuppoſed to have taken this particular Method, which we ſee he has to ſave Mankind.

(z) Charge of Socin. *p.* 4. *col.* 2.

Our Libeller pretends to ground this virulent Accuſation upon the Archbiſhop's denying the Poſition of thoſe who maintain that God could not poſſibly any other way have ſaved Mankind, becauſe his Juſtice could not poſſibly any other way have been ſatisfied. For the Archbiſhop had expreſly aſſerted, (*a*) "That it is great preſumption and bold-"neſs in any Man to affirm, that the Infinite Wiſdom "could not have brought about the Salvation of Men by "any other way than this very way in which he hath "done it. Which according to our Libeller, is *rank Socinianiſm.*

(*a*) Serm. 4. *p.* 181.

When the Archbiſhop had once laid down this for a certain Poſition, (which is not his ſingle Opinion, being aſſerted by *Grotius*, and many Orthodox Divines both at home and abroad, before him) he was obliged to aſſign other reaſons for the Incarnation of the Son of God, than that which is conſtantly given by thoſe who ſtand up for the *Vindictive Juſtice of God*, as they are pleaſed to call it.

For the Queſtion is not, Whether a *Satisfaction* was neceſſary before God could have pardon'd Sin? That the Archbiſhop no where denies; but, Whether *any other Satisfaction* could, if God had ſo pleaſed, have been ſufficient? If it could not, then that is a full and adequate Reaſon why God, after he had decreed to pardon Sin, reſolved that his Son

ſhould

ſhould in the fulneſs of time aſſume our Nature, who conſequently did then aſſume it. If it might, and our Archbiſhop dares not aſſert the contrary, then one is naturally led to enquire, Why, when God might have accepted of a leſs ſatisfaction without injuring any of his Attributes, he yet choſe to accept of this? *A Satisfaction* is allow'd on all hands to be due to God's Juſtice: *This Satisfaction* was pitched upon for other reaſons than that of the inſufficiency of any other beſides. Our Libeller thought fit to confound theſe things together, that ſo he might throw more duſt into his Readers eyes, and render his Calumnies the more plauſible. But it is time now to conſider the Reaſons aſſigned by the Archbiſhop.

Which before I do, I ſhall only premiſe this one thing, namely, That in caſe the Reaſons which he gives ſhould not have been any of the Inducements, upon which God choſe to work out our Salvation, yet it do's not in the leaſt follow from thence, that the Archbiſhop was a *Socinian*, or inclined to Socinianiſm. That man do's not deny the Incarnation of the Son of God, who gives wrong reaſons why he was incarnate; nor do's he invalidate the Satisfaction which was made to the Juſtice of God by the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt that was ſhed upon the Croſs, who ſays, "That he thinks it is great preſumption and boldneſs to ſay, that God could not any other way have "brought about the Salvation of Mankind, than by this "very way in which he hath done it. This I think is ſo plain, that it needs no proof, and yet this is the only thing that looks like a colour for all that malicious Stuff, which the Libeller has upon this occaſion vented againſt the Archbiſhop.

His two firſt Reaſons our Libeller paſſes over, becauſe if he had mentioned them, he had overthrown all that he has ſaid. But tho he paſſes them over, I muſt not: They are theſe, (1.) (*b*) "God ſent his Son into the World to "vindicate the Honour of his Laws, which, if Sin had "gone altogether unpuniſhed, would have been in great "danger of falling into contempt. (2.) (*c*) That he "might forgive Sin in ſuch a way as yet effectually to diſcountenance

(*b*) Sermon of Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 6.
(*c*) Ibid. *p.* 7.

" diſcountenance and diſcourage it, and to create in us " the greateſt horrour and hatred of it, which could not have " been by an abſolute Pardon without any Puniſhment " inflicted, or Satisfaction made to the Honour of his Ju- " ſtice.

Theſe Reaſons, which are expreſs againſt the *Socinians*, being paſſed over, our Libeller exclaims only againſt the reſt, namely, (*d*) " That Chriſt was incarnate in great " condeſcention to the weakneſs and common Prejudices of " Mankind: (*e*) That as in ſome of the Laws given by *Moſes*, " God was pleaſed particularly to conſider the hardneſs of " the hearts of the *Jews*; ſo he ſeems likewiſe to have very " much ſuited the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel, and the " Method of our Salvation by the Incarnation and Suf- " ferings of his Son, to the common Prejudices of Man- " kind: (*f*) That the World was much given to admire " Myſteries in Religion; the *Jews* had theirs, ſeveral of " which by God's own appointment were reſerved and kept " ſecret in a great meaſure from the People; the Heathen " likewiſe had theirs; the Devil always affecting to imi- " tate God ſo far as ſerved his wicked and malicious de- " ſigns; therefore here was a Myſtery indeed; a Myſtery " beyond all diſpute, and beyond all compariſon: (*g*) That " ſince there was a great inclination in Mankind to the " Worſhip of a viſible and a ſenſible Deity, God was plea- " ſed to appear in our Nature; that they who were ſo " fond of a viſible Deity, might have one to whom they " might pay Divine Worſhip without danger of Idolatry, " and without injury to the Divine Nature: (*h*) That " ſince Men had a notion of the Expiation of the Sins of " Men, and appeaſing the offended Deity by Sacrifices (and " of Men too), God compli'd with this their Notion, and " ſuch a Sacrifice was pitched upon as was full and per- " fect, and conſequently adequate to the true intention of " an Expiatory Sacrifice: (*i*) That ſince the Superſtition of " the World thought it too great a preſumption to ad- " dreſs their Requeſts and Supplications to the Deity " immediately; and alſo (*k*) canonized after their Deaths " thoſe Eminent Perſons who in their life-time had

(*d*) Serm. iii. *p.* 136.
(*e*) Serm. iv. *p.* 186, 187.
(*f*) Ibid. *p.* 188, 189, 190.
(*g*) Ibid. *p.* 190, 191.
(*h*) Ibid. *p.* 191, 192, 193.
(*i*) Ibid. *p.* 195.
(*k*) Ibid. *p.* 194.

(*l*) Ibid. *p.* 196.

" been great Benefactors to Mankind; (*l*) therefore God " was pleaſed to conſtitute and appoint one in our Na- " ture to be a perpetual Advocate and Interceſſor in Hea- " ven for us, to offer up our Prayers to God his Father, " and to obtain Mercy for us, and Grace to help in time of " need.

Theſe, with the two firſt named, are the Reaſons aſſigned by the Archbiſhop, why God pitched upon this particular way to bring about the Salvation of Mankind; after which he concludes, (*m*) " That for theſe Ends " and Reaſons, and perhaps for many more as great and " conſiderable as theſe, which our ſhallow Underſtandings " are not able to fathom, the Wiſdom of God hath pitch'd " upon this Way and Method of delivering Mankind from " the guilt and dominion of Sin by the Sacrifice of his " Son.

(*m*) Sermon of Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 13, 14.

To prove this the more effectually, the Archbiſhop obſerves, " That the Religion and Laws which God gave to " the *Jews*, were far from being the beſt and moſt per- " fect in themſelves; in which ſenſe he ſays, That ſome un- " derſtand that paſſage in *Ezekiel*, where it is ſaid, That " *God gave them Statutes which were not good*; that is, very im- " perfect in compariſon of what he could and would have " given them, had they been capable of them, and yet ſuch " as were well ſuited to their preſent capacity and circum- " ſtances (*n*).

(*n*) Serm. iv. *p.* 184.

All this, how true ſoever, is by our Libeller repreſented as *Abſurd*, *Barbarous*, and *Blaſphemous*; and to make it appear ſo, he has dreſſed it up in ſuch Expreſſions as truly anſwer to thoſe Epithets which he has faſten'd upon the Archbiſhop's Notion. And indeed (to uſe his own words) what he ſays upon this occaſion, (*o*) *makes all my Fleſh creep, and my Soul tremble within me*, as often as I read it, and much more when I write it down, which I ſhould forbear to do, if it were not neceſſary to my deſign to leave this Slanderer perfectly without excuſe.

(*o*) Charge of Socinianiſm, *p.* 6. *col.* 2.

For after he has ſaid what he thinks fit about the Archbiſhop's Notion, he breaks out into this horrid Rapture, (*p*) " Bleſſed God! this Man makes no more of the Myſte-

(*p*) Ibid.

ries

"ries of our Religion, than to ſatisfy Mens fooliſh curio-
"ſities. He that will have a May-pole, ſhall have a May-
"pole. Since you will have Myſteries, here's one for you,
"*God manifeſt in the Fleſh.* This is to ſatisfy your fooliſh
"longing after Myſteries, and to give you your fill of My-
"ſteries. Was there ever ſo impious a Burleſque upon God,
"and upon the Religion of Chriſt? As if he was incar-
"nate for no other end, but to make People wonder and
"gaze, and becauſe of the Myſtery forſooth! And that
"he was crucify'd only to outdo *Raw-head and Bloody-bones*,
"the inhumanity of the Heathen Sacrifices! That is, to
"cure the wickedneſs and folly of Men by overacting them
"in both! For what are Myſteries, without any further
"conſideration than as Myſteries, that is, Wonders and
"ſtrange things, but the height of folly, perfect Raree-
"ſhews? And what an account is it of Religion to ſay,
"*That God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, to ſatisfy ſuch childiſh
"Curioſities, and becauſe the World was given to admire
"Myſteries?

Who can forbear crying out with the injured *Pſalmiſt*, who in his diſtreſs cry'd unto the Lord againſt *Doeg*, and he heard him (*q*), *What ſhall be given unto thee? or what ſhall be done unto thee, thou falſe tongue?* But I muſt forbear; I am vindicating that Man, in whoſe Study a bundle of Libels was found after his Death, (and this perhaps in Manuſcript amongſt the reſt) with this Inſcription, *Theſe are Libels, God forgive them, I do.* I ſhall only therefore obſerve how foully he is miſrepreſented by this Libeller, before he comes to this Exclamation.

(*q*) Pſal. cxx. 3.

The Archbiſhop had aſſerted that (amongſt other Reaſons) Jeſus Chriſt was ſent into the World to comply with ſome general Notions, (*r*) which were ſo univerſal, that they
"ſeem to have had their Original from the firſt Parents of
"Mankind, either immediatly after the Creation, or after
"the Flood; (*s*) and thereby to wean them by degrees from
"their groſs Conceptions of things, and rectify more eaſily
"their wrong apprehenſions, by gratifying them in ſome
"meaſure, and (*t*) effectually extirpate the Idolatry which
"the chuſing wrong Mediators led them into; and (*u*) alſo
"perfectly

(*r*) Serm. iv. *p.* 192.
(*s*) Ibid. *p.* 187.
(*t*) Ibid. *p.* 196.
(*u*) Ibid. *p.* 205.

" perfectly to ſupply the two great wants, concerning which " Mankind was at ſo great a loſs before, namely the want " of an effectual Expiatory Sacrifice for Sin upon Earth, " and of a prevalent Mediator and Interceſſor with God in " Heaven.

All this, which ſetting the laſt part aſide, was no more than what God had already done for the *Jews*, our Scribler calumniates, and in order to that miſrepreſents.

For whereas the Archbiſhop calls theſe general Notions, *Weakneſs and Common Prejudices*, (*w*) *inveterate Prejudices*, and (*x*) *groſs Apprehenſions*; our Libeller calls them, under a pretence that the Archbiſhop had done ſo too, (*y*) *fooliſh and wicked Fancies*, (*z*) *wild and wicked Fancies*, (*a*) *diabolical Prejudices*, (*b*) *wicked and abominable Prejudices*, (*c*) *wicked Suggeſtions that the Devil had put into the minds of Men*, and the like. Now there is a great deal of difference between what the Archbiſhop ſays, and what he is made to ſay by this Libeller. *Effects of Weakneſs* may ariſe from the Infirmities to which we are all ſubject, and ſo be very far from being *Suggeſtions of the Devil*. *Adam* by eating of the forbidden Fruit, had offended God, for which offence he was thruſt out of Paradiſe. We know of no poſitive Laws which the Ante-Diluvian Patriarchs were obliged to obſerve, after our firſt Parents were driven out of Paradiſe, except that of keeping the Sabbath, and of having but one Wife. But how to appeaſe God already offended, and how to be aſſured that their Prayers ſhould be effectually heard as they had occaſion to offer them up, they ſeem to have been in a good meaſure at a loſs, if we may argue from *Moſes*'s Silence in the firſt five Chapters of *Geneſis*. If then *Adam* and his Poſterity until *Noah* were left to themſelves to Worſhip God by the Natural Light of their own Reaſon, as for any thing which appears to us the contrary they were; 'tis no wonder, if in a compaſs of Ages they embraced ſome general Notions which took univerſal Root; and which, upon the ſending of his Son into the World, God might graciouſly think fit to comply with, by giving ſuch a Law upon ſuch grounds as might direct Mens practice aright according to their preconceived

(*w*) Ibid. *p.* 206.
(*x*) Ibid. *p.* 186.
(*y*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 4. *col.* 2.
(*z*) Ibid.
(*a*) Ibid. *p.* 5. *col.* 1.
(*b*) Ibid. *col.* 2.
(*c*) Ibid *p.* 6. *col.* 2.

conceived Notions, and thereby wean them from any *Superſtitious Cuſtoms*, which in ſo long time might take too general root among them. So that tho the *Cuſtoms* afterwards introduced, might be ſinful, yet that is no reaſon why the *Original Notions* from which ſome Men by the inſtigation of the Devil took occaſion to introduce theſe *Cuſtoms*, ſhould have any ſinfulneſs in them; ſince there is ſo great a difference between *Sinfulneſs and Weakneſs*, and between the neceſſary effects of each. And ſince it has been but too frequently ſeen, that wicked Men have turned good Deſigns, and wreſted good Principles to impious Purpoſes, it may rationally be conceived, that when once Men had imbibed a Notion of the neceſſity of a Mediator between them and God, and of Expiation of Sin by Sacrifice, being ignorant of the right way how to come at the one, and to do the other, the Devil might take advantage of this their ignorance, and lead them to practiſes truly worthy of ſuch a Tempter.

It is injuriouſly done therefore in our Libeller to confound things together, ſo very different in their Natures, as *Notions* and *Conſequences* afterwards drawn from thoſe *Notions* and *Practices* taken up upon theſe *Conſequences*. For theſe *Notions* and *inveterate Prejudices* (*c*), were the almoſt unavoidable *Conſequences* of Man's Condition after the Fall, who ſaw himſelf deſtitute of help, and God, from whom his help was to come, offended, and teſtifying his Diſpleaſure by thoſe ſevere Diſpenſations of his Providence which they had ſo diſmally ſmarted under; the Flood particularly, which one would think all Mankind could not but take warning by. Therefore the Son of God took our Nature upon him to comply with theſe *Notions* and *General Apprehenſions*. But the *ſuperſtitious* and *inhumane Practices*, into which ſome Nations were led by the Temptations of the Devil, who took an advantage of this their Blindneſs, were not *indulged* nor *imitated*, as this Libeller prophanely ſpeaks firſt himſelf, and then pretends to father upon the Archbiſhop. Thoſe the Son of God came to wean Men from, and by ſo doing deſtroy the Works of the Devil. This I think was a deſign worthy of God, and theſe Reaſons are by

(*c*) *i. e.* Common preconceived Notions, which through long continuance had taken deep footing, and were generally received in the World.

by no means unbecoming his Infinite Wiſdom, as far as we ignorant Wretches are able to judge. At leaſt, this muſt be moſt manifeſt, that after the Archbiſhop had in his Diſcourſe *concerning the Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt*, in the firſt place plainly aſſerted, *That the Son of God was made Man, and ſuffered upon Earth to vindicate the Honour of God's Laws, that Satisfaction might be made to the Honour of his Juſtice, and alſo to create in us the greateſt horror and hatred of Sin poſſible*; for this Libeller to affirm that the Archbiſhop has *betrayed and corrupted the Chriſtian Religion by giving us an Abſurd, Barbarous, and Blaſphemous Repreſentation* of it, when in that very Repreſentation he ſays nothing but what is ſuitable to God's own Methods upon another occaſion: I ſay, for this Libeller thus to accuſe the Archbiſhop, is one of the moſt abominable, of the moſt unjuſt, and of the vileſt Slanders that ever was uttered againſt a Prelate of his Worth and Character in the Chriſtian World.

Beſides, we are here to conſider, that God foreſaw, tho not decreed the Fall of Man, and his ſubſequent Ruin without free Grace; he foreſaw alſo what courſes Man would run into, and what general Notions he would imbibe in his helpleſs and forlorn Eſtate: all this he as much foreſaw, as he did the hard-heartedneſs of his Ancient People the *Jews*; ſo that when we ſee the hardneſs of their hearts ſo much compli'd with, as we find it was in the Moſaical Diſpenſation, I can diſcern no ſuch Blaſphemy in aſſerting, that ſince theſe things were all foreſeen by, and known to God, before the Foundations of the World were laid, regard ſhould be had to them in that Decree by which he did from all Eternity reſolve that his Son ſhould in the fulneſs of time take our Nature upon him, and make ſuch an Expiation for us as God would accept of, and be ſuch a Mediator as we wanted. For theſe Notions, if miſtaken, were the effects of Weakneſs, not of Malice; whereas the hard-heartedneſs of the *Jews* proceeded from Stubbornneſs, Obſtinacy, and Unbelief, three of the moſt provoking Sins that a People could be guilty of towards their Benefactor, and above all, their God.

But after all, the Archbiſhop no where denies, That the *Notion of the Neceſſity of a Mediator, and of Expiation of Sin by Sacrifice*, did originally come from God by an immediate Revelation to *Adam*, or ſome of the firſt Patriarchs of the old World. Of the Notion of Expiation of Sin by Sacrifice, he expreſly ſays, "Whether it had its riſe from Di-"vine Revelation, and was afterwards propagated from "Age to Age by Tradition; I ſay from whence ſoever "this Notion came, it hath of all other Notions concern-"ing Religion, excepting thoſe of the Being of God, and "his Providence, and of the Recompences of another Life, "found the moſt univerſal Reception, and the thing hath "been the moſt generally practiced in all Ages and Nations, "not only in the old, but in the new-diſcovered Parts of the "World.

And tho he ſays nothing to inſinuate the ſame of the Notion of a Mediator; yet he ſays nothing againſt it; He do's not call it a *Weakneſs*, much leſs (*d*) a *Superſtitious Opinion*, (*e*) (as our Libeller impudently charges him) but only (*f*) a *Common Apprehenſion*, which is equally true, whether it came originally from God or no. And I ſuppoſe no Man needs be told how different the Notions of *Superſtition* and *Common Apprehenſions* are.

(*d*) P. 6. col. 1.

(*e*) The pretence to this Charge ariſes from theſe words (*Serm. iv. p.* 195.)

"The World was mightily bent upon addreſſing their Requeſts and Supplications, not to "the Deity immediately, becauſe their Superſtition thought that too great a preſumption, "but by ſome Mediators between the gods and them, who might with advantage in this "humble manner preſent their Requeſts ſo as to find acceptance. 'Tis plain, that the word *Superſtition* here, which our Libeller interprets, as if the Archbiſhop had underſtood it abſolutely of offering up Petitions to the Deity by a *Mediator*, relates only to the Heathens not going immediately to God, but applying themſelves to thoſe who had no Power to intercede. That indeed was a Superſtitious Notion, and ſo our Libeller himſelf owns, when he ſays, (p. 6. col. 1.) *That the Heathens miſtook the Mediator, and that therein was their Superſtition and Idolatry.* What can this Conceſſion be, but giving himſelf the Lye? He charges the Archbiſhop with Blaſphemy, for ſaying, That the Notion of the Neceſſity of a Mediator, which the Heathens had, was ſuperſtitious; when it is evident to any Man living that reads the words, that the Archbiſhop ſays only what this Libeller owns himſelf, namely, That in miſtaking the Mediator, and taking thoſe to intercede, whoſe Interceſſions could not poſſibly be available, the Ancient Heathens were guilty of Superſtition and *Idolatry* too, (in worſhipping theſe their inſignificant Mediators) as the Archbiſhop alſo calls it in the next Page.

(*f*) Serm. iv. p. 196.

Here.

Here, I ſuppoſe, no Man will blame the Archbiſhop for being cautious in aſſerting things to be revealed to us, that we cannot be poſitive about, whether they are revealed or not. He is accuſed of maintaining, (*g*) "That thoſe Revela-
(z) Charge of Socin *p.* 5. *col.* 1.
"tions which *all the Chriſtian World* has hitherto believ'd God "gave at the beginning to *Adam*, and after to the Patri-"archs and Prophets more expreſly of the promiſed Seed; "and that thoſe Types and Inſtitutions which God from the "beginning did appoint as ſhadows and ſenſible Repreſen-"tations of the Expiatory Death of Chriſt upon the Croſs, "ſuch as Sacrifices, which for this end were commanded to "*Adam*, practiſed by *Cain* and *Abel* his Children, and de-"ſcended by uninterrupted Tradition, even to his Heathen "Poſterity; tho they knew not their Original, more than "they did their own, or the Worlds, were only Fancies and "Imaginations, which came (he knows not how) into "Mens brains.

What has been already ſaid, ſhews the horrid Injuſtice of this Accuſation. What Revelations do we read of given to *Adam* concerning Expiatory Sacrifices? Will any Man poſitively ſay, That the Sacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel* were any other than Offerings of Thankſgiving? Have not Dr. *Outram* (*h*), and Dr. *Spencer* (*i*) abundantly proved, That the moſt conſiderable of the Ancient Fathers, and the Learned-eſt of the *Jewiſh Rabbins*, who have treated of theſe matters, have taught, that the Ante-Diluvian Patriarchs, and indeed all before *Moſes*, ſacrificed only by the Light of Nature, without any Precepts about ſacrificing in general, tho perhaps ſome of them, as *Abraham* had, might receive Orders to offer up this or that particular Sacrifice? And do not theſe two Learned Divines take pains to prove, that it was their Opinion alſo, as well as the Ancients? Dr. *Outram* pretends, indeed, not to give his Opinion of either ſide, tho the pains he takes to ſet this Opinion in a full Light, rather than that of thoſe who hold that Sacrifices were commanded originally by God, ſhews his Propenſity to it, which is enough for my preſent purpoſe, ſince neither he who wrote expreſly againſt the *Socinians*, nor Dr. *Spencer*, were ever accuſed of leaning to them in their Writings. Highly probable

(*h*) De Sacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. 1.
(*i*) Lib. 3. De legib. Hebræor. Diſſert. 2. cap. 4.

probable that God might reveal ſomething concerning them to *Adam*, and this probability the Archbiſhop hints at in the words before alledged; but farther, he nor no Man elſe can directly gather from the words of Scripture (*which* and *which only* are, as I take it, to be our Guides) what God has revealed, and what he has not. None but Men of our Libeller's Impudence will pretend to find Revelations where (for ought they know) there are none; much leſs dare they aſſert things for certain Truths, and then calumniate others for not aſſerting the ſame, which at the moſt are but probabilities.

But there is no part of the Archbiſhop's Notion ſo much exclaimed againſt, as what he ſays of Myſteries. 'Twas that occaſioned the foul-mouth'd Rapture which I quoted above: let us therefore examine it. The Archbiſhop had aſſigned it as a ſecondary Reaſon, why Jeſus Chriſt was ſent into the World, (*k*) "That Men who were much given "to admire Myſteries in Religion, might have one that "was a Myſtery indeed, ſuch a one as ſhould obſcure and "ſwallow up all other Myſteries. In proof of which, he quoted what the Apoſtle St. *Paul* ſays of the great Myſtery of the Chriſtian Religion in alluſion to, and contempt of the Heathen Myſteries: *Without Controverſy, great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God manifeſted in the Fleſh.* Is here now any thing Prophane or Blaſphemous? Is this a new (*l*) pitch of *Super-Hobbiſm*? Was not the greateſt, and the moſt auguſt part of the *Jewiſh* Worſhip kept ſecret from the People, that they might ſtand in greater awe of it? And do's not the Archbiſhop expreſly affirm, That the Devil in imitation of this Method, and knowing the efficacy of this Secrecy, to keep the deluded World in awe, involves all his Worſhip in Myſteries which were kept ſecret from the People? Is it not part of the weakneſs of Mankind, to deſpiſe and diſregard what they are familiarly acquainted with, and can perfectly comprehend? Would not Men have been eaſily tempted to have deſpiſed the Chriſtian Religion, if its Myſteries had been only ſuch Notions as thinking Men could have found out by the ſtrength of Natural Reaſon? Or what more poſſible way could have

(*k*) Serm. iv. *p.* 188, 189.

(*l*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 5. *col.* 1.

been contrived to ſecure a conſtant Veneration to be paid to it, than to have all its Duties plain and obvious, and all its Myſteries truly incomprehenſible by the acuteſt Wits, who ſhould at any time venture to explain them? Eſpecially, when the certainty of the Revelation was once ſecured, and Men were ſatisfied that they were obliged to believe nothing but what God, who cannot lye, required them to believe. If the Archbiſhop had ſet this down as a primary reaſon of the Chriſtian Oeconomy, it might have occaſioned ſome ſcruple; but when it is but ſlightly mentioned in compariſon of the reſt, the outcry againſt the Archbiſhop ſhews the Libeller's Malice; and if the Adnimadverter againſt the Dean of St. *Pauls* may be believed, his Prophaneneſs too (*m*).

(*m*) *See Preface to the Animadverſions upon Dr.* Sherlock's *Vindication*, &c. *Second Edition*, where he charges the Dean of St. *Paul's* with Blaſphemy for miſrepreſenting Dr. *Owen*, and making him utter ſuch Expreſſions as he pretended both to diſown and to abhor.

Beſides, if God be Omniſcient, he ſees every thing in all its poſſible views; he knows the Nature of Man, which is what Man knows not himſelf; knowing our Nature, he knows our Infirmities, and allows for them at the ſame time that he is angry with us for our Sins; conſequently he knows that it is one of our Infirmities to admire more what we cannot thoroughly comprehend, than what we can; and accordingly he knows, that this would be of great advantage to recommend the Chriſtian Religion to the unbelieving World. Why therefore this may not be allow'd as a ſecondary Reaſon, why God made choice of this myſterious way to ſave us, I cannot ſee.

Another outcry alſo, which our Libeller makes upon this occaſion, is, That God ſent his Son to be an Expiatory Sacrifice in compliance with an *unreaſonable Expectation* of Mankind. In anſwer to what he ſays, I ſhall firſt tranſcribe the Archbiſhop's words, which are theſe, (*n*) "The Nature "and Deſign of Expiatory Sacrifices was plainly this: To "ſubſtitute one living Creature to ſuffer and die inſtead of "another; ſo that what the Sinner deſerved to have ſuffer'd, was

(*n*) Sermon Concerning the Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 34, 35, 36.

"was ſuppoſed to be done to the Sacrifice, that is, it was "ſlain to make an Atonement for the Sinner. And tho "there was no Reaſon to hope for any ſuch effect from the "Blood of Bulls or Goats, or of any other living Creatures "that were wont to be offer'd up in Sacrifice; yet that both "*Jews* and *Heathens* did expect and hope for it, is ſo very "evident, that it cannot without extreme Ignorance or Ob-"ſtinacy be deni'd. But this *Expectation* how *unreaſonable* ſo-"ever, plainly ſhews it to have been the common apprehenſion "of Mankind, in all Ages, that God would not be appeaſed, "nor ſhould Sin be pardoned without ſuffering: But yet ſo, "that Men generally conceived good hopes, that upon the "Repentance of Sinners, God would accept of a *vicarious* "Puniſhment, that is, of the ſuffering of ſome other in their "ſtead.

To make all this paſs for (o) *dreadful Blaſphemy*, our Libeller begins his Quotation at theſe words, *But this Expectation how unreaſonable ſoever*, without taking any manner of notice of what paſſed before, upon the account of which he had affirmed, that this *Expectation* was *unreaſonable*. We know who quoted Scripture after this manner upon another occaſion; and if our Bleſſed Saviour's reaſoning be good, *his we are, whoſe Works we do.*

(o) Charge of Socin. *p.* 8. *col.* 1.

The Colour for this Slander lies in miſrepreſenting the word *Unreaſonable*. This word, as innumerable others, has two Senſes, the one proper, the other figurative. A thing is properly ſaid to be *unreaſonable* for which no reaſon drawn from the nature of the Subject-matter, which is in queſtion, can be aſſigned. A thing may and often is figuratively ſaid to be *unreaſonable*, which is *unjuſt*, *injurious*, or *wicked*. Now it is plain to any Man of common Senſe that reads the words already quoted, that the word *unreaſonable* is here only to be underſtood in its proper Signification. For in thoſe words, which our Libeller left out, the Archbiſhop had laid it down for a certain Propoſition, That there was *no reaſon* in the thing it ſelf for any Man to hope that the Blood of Bulls and Goats ſhould expiate Sin, tho both *Jews* and *Heathens* did expect and hope for it; and it was

only in purſuance of this Propoſition, that he ſaid this was *unreaſonable.*

Pray now where is the harm of aſſerting, That God complied with a general Expectation that all the World had, that a *vicarious Puniſhment* for Sin ſhould be accepted, tho Men could draw no reaſon from the nature of the thing to expect that ſuch a *vicarious Puniſhment* would be eſteemed ſatisfactory by an angry God? The truth is, the *unreaſonableneſs of this Expectation* in the literal Senſe of the words, is (for ought I know) one of the beſt and ſtrongeſt Arguments to prove, that Sacrifices were immediately inſtituted by God, which has been lately excellently purſued by Dr. *Williams*, in his Diſcourſe *of the certainty of a Divine Revelation.* So little reaſon had this Scribler to cavil at words which ſeem to have been founded upon that very Principle which he would be thought to patronize; and which from hence it appears, that he do's not thoroughly underſtand. But, how ſtrong ſoever the probabilities are, and I do not go about in the leaſt to abate their ſtrength, yet we have no poſitive aſſurance that God did actually poſſeſs Mankind with this Principle. We have already ſeen, That very Learned Men, both Ancient and Modern, are of another Opinion. If he did not, then pray what reaſon, what juſt ground could Men have to think that God would accept of a *vicarious Puniſhment*, eſpecially the Blood of Beaſts? How unavailable the Blood of Beaſts, or of ſinful Men is in this caſe, appears from God's ſending a ſufficient Sacrifice at laſt; and I ſuppoſe there is no need of Arguments to prove, that all *fruitleſs Expectations* are *unreaſonable.* Yet this was all the colour that our Libeller had for all this Clamour. For the Archbiſhop do's not ſay, That *the Notion* which the *Jews* and *Heathens* had, that God would accept of a *vicarious Puniſhment* was an *unreaſonable Notion.* He only ſays, That the *Expectation* which they had, that the Blood of Bulls and Goats, and much leſs of wicked Men like themſelves, would be accepted by God, was an *unreaſonable Expectation*; which Aſſertion of the Archbiſhop's is exactly ſuitable to the Doctrine of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and conſequently

ly (even in our Libeller's Judgment, as I ſuppoſe) not Blaſphemy.

Before I diſmiſs this Head, I ſhall take notice of an Inſinuation of our Libeller's in his Preface, which affects both the Archbiſhop and his Vindicator Dr. *Williams*, and both of them injuriouſly alike. He ſays, That the *Socinian Conſiderer* having excepted to the Reaſons aſſigned by the Archbiſhop for the Incarnation of the Son of God, Dr. *Williams* vindicates ſome of them, but leaves theſe which have been here conſidered, *totally untouched*; and then he refers his Reader to the 61ſt and 62d Pages of the Doctor's Vindication; after which he goes on thus, "Whether they "were material to be anſwered, I leave to what follows. "And whether they are anſwerable upon Chriſtian Princi-"ples, I leave to the Judgment of the Reader, and this ſort "of No-vindication of them. Doubtleſs Dr. *Tillotſon* would "read this Vindication of himſelf, before he licens'd it to be "printed. And if he could have given any Anſwer to theſe "moſt monſtrous Objections made againſt him, he would "certainly have done it; wherefore we muſt conclude him "Self-condemned.

This Author betrays himſelf to be a careleſs Reader that ſhall affirm, The Archbiſhop licenſed Dr. *Williams*'s *Vindication*; and much more, when he comes in with his *doubtleſs he had read it*. For the Doctor in his *Epiſtle to Mr.* Chadwick, expreſly ſaith, he *peruſed* but a *part of it*; and I may tell him a very ſmall part, ſince it was but the Week before his *Grace* fell ill and died, that any part of it was put into his hands.

By this ſly Accuſation, the *Socinian Conſiderer* has wrong-done him, and accordingly ought to be righted; for tho he except againſt the Archbiſhop's Reaſons, yet he does not except againſt them as *Blaſphemous Errors*, (as this Libeller calls them in the words immediately following thoſe already quoted) but only as unſufficient to prove that, for which they are produced by the Archbiſhop, which are two very different things. Dr. *Williams* alſo has reaſon to complain, for inſtead of leaving theſe things *totally untouched* in the very Pages quoted by this Libeller, he makes the

very

very Anſwer which it was proper for him to make. For in this Anſwer he ſhews, that if the *Conſiderer*'s way of reaſoning be good, not only the Son of God ought not to have been incarnate ſo long after *Adam*'s Fall, but neither (according to the *Socinian Hypotheſis*) ought Chriſt to have come into the World, or the Goſpel to have been preached. So that his Argument by proving too much, proves nothing at all; and Dr. *Williams* having ſhewn that it does ſo, makes a juſt Reply to what his Adverſary had objected. And for what he ſays of *Myſteries*, the Doctor ſays, *He would reſerve it for another place*, which was no *ſhift*, becauſe it was a Subject he thought more proper to reſerve for another place in his Book, *viz.* in his *Vindication* of the Biſhop of *Worceſter*; but in the time between, he had a ſight of a Book fitting for the Preſs, wherein the Notion of *Myſtery* was excellently diſcourſed of; and therefore the Doctor refers his Reader expreſly thither, in *p.* 68. of the ſaid *Vindication*. And laſtly, That the Archbiſhop in the third place has wrong done him by this Inſinuation, is evident from what has been ſaid, which I ſhall not now repeat.

SECT. VI.

The Charge of Blaſphemy *Anſwered about the* Jewiſh *Law.*

BLASPHEMY being a word which our Libeller often has in his Mouth, he uſes it upon the Archbiſhop's account of the Law given by *Moſes* (*p*), "and of the Di-
(*p*) Serm. iv. p. 183, 184. "ſpenſation of God towards the *Jewiſh* Nation, which (ac-
"cording to him) was full of condeſcenſion to the Tem-
"per and Prejudices, and other Circumſtances of that Peo-
"ple: For (as he there goes on) the Religion and Laws
"which God gave them, were far from being the beſt and
"moſt perfect in themſelves, in which ſenſe ſome under-
"ſtand that paſſage in *Ezekiel*, where it is ſaid, *That God*
"*gave*

"*gave them Statutes which were not good*, that is, very im-
"perfect in compariſon of what he could and would have
"given them, had they been capable of them; and yet
"ſuch as were very well ſuited and fitted to their pre-
"ſent Capacity and Circumſtances. Of which expreſſions
our Libeller's Character is, (*q*) "That in them he ſcru- (*q*) Charge of
"ples not impiouſly to blaſpheme that Religion which Socinianiſm,
"God gave to the *Jews*, and therein to arraign God its Au- *p.* 7. *col.* 2.
"thor.

To prove this bold Charge, he makes a tedious Harangue in commendation of the Laws which God gave the *Jews*, which his commendation is very true; but as it is here brought in, 'tis nothing at all to his purpoſe, unleſs it be to ſhew his Malice. The Laws given by *Moſes* were of ſeveral ſorts, and given at ſeveral times. Some were Moral, as the Decalogue; ſome Judicial, which peculiarly related to the *Jews* as they were a People united under one Government; ſome again were Ceremonial, as all thoſe were which concerned their Prieſthood, and their Sacrifices, their Purifications, their Clothes, and the like. Of theſe laſt there were two ſorts; ſome were typical of that great Expiatory Sacrifice made by Chriſt, of which we have a full Account in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; others were deſigned to keep the *Iſraelites* from ſome particular Idolatries that were practiſed by the Nations which were round about them. As for the time in which they were given, ſome were given before the *Iſraelites* made the Golden Calf, others afterwards.

Having premiſed all this, which even our Libeller himſelf cannot deny, I ſhall conſider what the Prophet *Ezekiel* ſays to the *Jews* in the xxth Chapter of his Prophecy. Some of the Elders of the People being come to enquire of the Lord, becauſe of the diſtreſs which they were in at that time from the *Babylonians*, the Prophet tells them from the Lord, That they ought a little to look back upon the condition of their Forefathers in *Egypt*, when God firſt lifted up his hand to bring them out of *Egypt* into the Land of *Canaan*. (*r*) Firſt, he upbraids them with their (*r*) Ver. 7, 8.
unwillingneſs to leave the Abominations of *Egypt*, tho they had

very Anſwer which it was proper for him to make. For in this Anſwer he ſhews, that if the *Conſiderer*'s way of reaſoning be good, not only the Son of God ought not to have been incarnate ſo long after *Adam*'s Fall, but neither (according to the *Socinian Hypotheſis*) ought Chriſt to have come into the World, or the Goſpel to have been preached. So that his Argument by proving too much, proves nothing at all; and Dr. *Williams* having ſhewn that it does ſo, makes a juſt Reply to what his Adverſary had objected. And for what he ſays of *Myſteries*, the Doctor ſays, *He would reſerve it for another place*, which was no *ſhift*, becauſe it was a Subject he thought more proper to reſerve for another place in his Book, *viz.* in his *Vindication* of the Biſhop of *Worceſter*; but in the time between, he had a ſight of a Book fitting for the Preſs, wherein the Notion of *Myſtery* was excellently diſcourſed of; and therefore the Doctor refers his Reader expreſly thither, in *p.* 68. of the ſaid *Vindication*. And laſtly, That the Archbiſhop in the third place has wrong done him by this Inſinuation, is evident from what has been ſaid, which I ſhall not now repeat.

SECT. VI.

The Charge of Blaſphemy *Anſwered about the* Jewiſh *Law.*

BLASPHEMY being a word which our Libeller often has in his Mouth, he uſes it upon the Archbiſhop's account of the Law given by *Moſes* (*p*), "and of the Di-
(*p*) Serm. iv. p. 183, 184. "ſpenſation of God towards the *Jewiſh* Nation, which (ac-
"cording to him) was full of condeſcenſion to the Tem-
"per and Prejudices, and other Circumſtances of that Peo-
"ple: For (as he there goes on) the Religion and Laws
"which God gave them, were far from being the beſt and
"moſt perfect in themſelves, in which ſenſe ſome under-
"ſtand that paſſage in *Ezekiel*, where it is ſaid, *That God*
"*gave*

"*gave them Statutes which were not good*, that is, very im-
"perfect in compariſon of what he could and would have
"given them, had they been capable of them; and yet
"ſuch as were very well ſuited and fitted to their pre-
"ſent Capacity and Circumſtances. Of which expreſſions
our Libeller's Character is, (*q*) "That in them he ſcru-
"ples not impiouſly to blaſpheme that Religion which
"God gave to the *Jews*, and therein to arraign God its Au-
"thor.

(*q*) Charge of Socinianiſm, *p.* 7. *col.* 2.

To prove this bold Charge, he makes a tedious Harangue in commendation of the Laws which God gave the *Jews*, which his commendation is very true; but as it is here brought in, 'tis nothing at all to his purpoſe, unleſs it be to ſhew his Malice. The Laws given by *Moſes* were of ſeveral ſorts, and given at ſeveral times. Some were Moral, as the Decalogue; ſome Judicial, which peculiarly related to the *Jews* as they were a People united under one Government; ſome again were Ceremonial, as all thoſe were which concerned their Prieſthood, and their Sacrifices, their Purifications, their Clothes, and the like. Of theſe laſt there were two ſorts; ſome were typical of that great Expiatory Sacrifice made by Chriſt, of which we have a full Account in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; others were deſigned to keep the *Iſraelites* from ſome particular Idolatries that were practiſed by the Nations which were round about them. As for the time in which they were given, ſome were given before the *Iſraelites* made the Golden Calf, others afterwards.

Having premiſed all this, which even our Libeller himſelf cannot deny, I ſhall conſider what the Prophet *Ezekiel* ſays to the *Jews* in the xxth Chapter of his Prophecy. Some of the Elders of the People being come to enquire of the Lord, becauſe of the diſtreſs which they were in at that time from the *Babylonians*, the Prophet tells them from the Lord, That they ought a little to look back upon the condition of their Forefathers in *Egypt*, when God firſt lifted up his hand to bring them out of *Egypt* into the Land of *Canaan*. (*r*) Firſt, he upbraids them with their unwillingneſs to leave the Abominations of *Egypt*, tho they

(*r*) Ver. 7, 8.

had

had been so severely used by the Men of that Country, and had groaned so earnestly after a Deliverance (*s*). However (as he tells them afterwards) God did bring them out of *Egypt*, whilest they were polluted with the Idolatries of that Country, and gave them Statutes in the Wilderness, *which if a Man do, he shall even live in them* (*t*); and yet for all this, that Generation rebelled against him in the Wilderness, and walked not in his Statutes, and despised those *Judgments*, *which if a Man do, he shall even live in them*, for which reason he threatned to destroy them (*u*). However, for his own Names sake, God wrought that it should not be polluted [*i. e.* set at nought, and vilify'd, as if he who had brought them into the Wilderness, could not there preserve them] before the Heathen [*i. e.* the *Egyptians*] in whose sight he had brought them out. But (*w*) yet he punished them for their Idolatries, by causing that whole Generation to wander in the Wilderness, and suffering none but *Caleb* and *Joshua* to reach the promised Land. And (*x*) because the following Generations were not like to do any better than their Fathers had done before them, but would not execute the Judgments of God, and would despise his Statutes, and pollute his Sabbaths, and fix their Eyes upon their Father's Idols, therefore (*y*) *GOD GAVE THEM STATUTES THAT WERE NOT GOOD, AND JUDGMENTS WHEREBY THEY SHOULD NOT LIVE*; and *pronounced them polluted in their own gifts, in passing by all that openeth the Womb*, that he might disgrace them, to the end that they might know that he was the LORD.

(*s*) Ver. 10, 11.

(*t*) Ver. 13.

(*u*) Ver. 14.

(*w*) Ver. 15, 16.

(*x*) Ver. 21, &c.

(*y*) Ver. 25.

From hence it is manifest, That the *Statutes that were not good*, in the 25th Verse, are directly opposed to *the Statutes and Judgments which if a Man do, he shall even live in them*, in the 11th Verse; which very Statutes and Judgments they are blamed for despising in the 13th Verse. It is equally manifest, That *these Statutes that were not good, and Judgments whereby they should not live*, were *given* them by God as a *Judgment* for *not executing the Judgments of God, for despising his Statutes, polluting his Sabbaths, and turning their Eyes after their Fathers Idols*, which he upbraids them with in the Verse foregoing.

foregoing (z). So that if it be *preſumptuous and terrible Blaſphemy* to ſay, That God *gave them Statutes that were not good*, it is *ſuch Blaſphemy* as God himſelf put into the Mouth of his Prophet *Ezekiel*, to tell the Elders of *Iſrael* in his Name.

(z) Verſe 24.

But our Libeller ſays, (*a*) "That God is ſaid to give "them theſe *evil* Statutes, *v.* 25. no otherwiſe than as he is "ſaid to pollute them, *v.* 26. that is, to ſuffer them to be pol- "luted, and to follow Idolatry, there meant by the Statutes "which were not good. All which is very wide of, if not di- rectly contrary to the Prophet's meaning, as we ſhall ſoon ſee.

(*a*) Page 8. col. 1.

But before we can come to that, we muſt not overlook our Libeller's Prevarication, in calling theſe *Statutes which were not good*, *evil Statutes:* There is here a great deal of difference between *not good* and *evil*. *Good* here is not underſtood morally, and conſequently is not oppoſed to *evil*, but to *kind* and *merciful*; and therefore *not good*, is explain'd by theſe words, *whereby they ſhould not live*. In the ſame ſenſe St. *Peter* ſaid, That the Ceremonial Law was *a Yoke which neither they*, [*i. e.* the *Jews* of his time] *nor their Fathers were able to bear*. The miſtaking of this, gave our Libeller an opportunity to call theſe *evil Statutes*, and conſequently to make all this clamour.

Now to underſtand the Prophet's meaning more fully, we are to conſider, That ſoon after the *Iſraelites* were gotten to Mount *Sinai*, God gave them the Decalogue, and ſome few other Moral and Judicial Laws, fixed the Worſhip of the Tabernacle, conſtituted *Aaron* High-Prieſt, entailed the Prieſthood upon his Family, appointed the daily Sacrifice, and ſettled the Atonement which the High-Prieſt was to make yearly in the *Holy of Holies* for the whole People, wherein he was ſo immediately and properly a Type of Jeſus Chriſt, and his Atonement Typical of that great Expiatory Sacrifice, which our Bleſſed Saviour offered of himſelf upon the Croſs. This was the firſt Body of Laws which God gave by *Moſes*, and theſe were the *Judgments*, which if they would have obey'd they might have *lived in them*, that is, they would have had a pleaſant, eaſy Task, nothing which could in any ſenſe whatſoever have been accounted a Burthen, or a Yoke, by an ingenuous and a dutiful People.

Theſe Laws begin at the xxth, and end with the xxxiſt Chapter of *Exodus*.

Then comes the Revolt of the Children of *Iſrael*, who could not bear *Moſes*'s abſence for Forty Days, but muſt have viſible Repreſentations of God, and got *Aaron* to joyn with them. Hereupon God was greatly provoked, and tho at *Moſes*'s intreaty, and leſt his Name ſhould be polluted among the Heathen, he did not utterly deſtroy them, yet he then ſuperadded another Set of Laws, whereby they were chained up in almoſt every thing they did. They were reſtrained in Eating, and Drinking, and Cloathing, in Tilling the Ground, in obſerving particular Days, and Months, and Years. They were dealt withal as Children; and upon this very account St. *Paul* calls theſe ſuperadded Laws *weak and beggarly Rudiments*, and upbraids the *Galatians* with their *longing again to be in Bondage to them*. Which very Laws he ſays, *were given becauſe of Tranſgreſſion*, becauſe they ſhew'd ſo early a Propenſity to Idolatry; and which Propenſity it ſeems could no other way be curbed but by ſuch Reſtrictions as ſhould in every thing they did neceſſarily put them in mind of that God whom alone they were to Worſhip.

Such a Body of Laws given upon ſuch an occaſion, tho they could not be ſaid to be *Evil* (in the *Engliſh* ſenſe of the *word*) yet they might be very juſtly ſaid to be *not Good*. They were enacted as a Puniſhment for the former Idolatries of the *Iſraelites*, and as a fence againſt their relapſing into any new ones. And now, if our Libeller ſhould cavil, and ſay, That this was not a compliance with, and condeſcenſion to the Humours and Weakneſſes of the *Jews*; yet he will not be able to deny, but that it was an Accommodation, and ſuch a one as was peculiarly fitted to bridle and reſtrain them from running after ſtrange gods, tho it had not its full effect till after their return from *Babylon*.

To all this, which effectually vindicates the Archbiſhop's Aſſertion, and gives an account of what our Bleſſed Saviour often hints at, that ſuch and ſuch Laws were given by God to *Moſes*, *becauſe of the hardneſs of the hearts* of thoſe to whom they were given; I know nothing that can be objected, if we conſider what the Prophet ſays in

Verſe

Verſe 26. juſt after he had told them, That the LORD had given them *Statutes that were not good, and Judgments whereby they ſhould not live*; namely, *That he pronounced them unclean in their Gifts, in paſſing by all that opened the Womb, that he might diſgrace them, to the end that they might know that he was the LORD*: that is, " That he declared that he eſteem-
" ed them to be an unclean People, and unfit to ſerve at
" his Altar, or to offer up their own Gifts to him them-
" ſelves, in paſſing by all their firſt-born, whom he had
" ſet apart before for his Service, and in taking one par-
" ticular Tribe, the *Levites*, in their ſtead, which would
" be an eternal diſgrace upon them, when their lateſt Po-
" ſterities ſhould ſee themſelves irreverſibly ſhut out from
" Miniſtring before him, whereby they would of neceſſity
" ſee that he is *JEHOVAH*, a Jealous God, that would
" not ſuffer his Honour to be given to an Idol, or his Glory
" to another.

That this Interpretation agrees better with the Original, than that in our Common Verſions, will (I believe) appear evident to every one that will weigh the Reaſons upon which Dr. *Spencer* grounds it, from whom I own my ſelf to have received it. Tho the ſignification of the 25th Verſe, which our Libeller ſo much exclaims at, and which he accuſes of *preſumptuous and dreadful Blaſphemy*, ſtands equally firm, whether this be allow'd or no; and that deſtroys all his Calumnies; which is enough to my preſent purpoſe.

SECT. VII.

A Second Charge about our Saviour's Satisfaction *Anſwered.*

THIS Libeller charges the Archbiſhop with (*b*) " abſo-
" lutely and avowedly cutting off the whole Doctrine
" of Satisfaction due to the Juſtice of God for our Sins;
" or if due, that it need not be paid; and therefore, what-
" ever

(*b*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 8. *col.* 2.

" ever other Reaſons there may be, That can be none for " Chriſt's dying for us. All this has been ſpoken to at large already under the iv^th^ Head; and therefore I ſhall only ſay, That he who poſitively affirms that God did accept of the Satisfaction made by Chriſt, and who proves that Jeſus Chriſt did in the propereſt Senſe of the words ſuffer in our ſtead, does as fully own this Satisfaction, tho he dares not affirm that God's Juſtice could not have been ſatisfied any other way, or that God could not have pardon'd Sin without any Satisfaction at all; as he who grounds the neceſſity of this Satisfaction upon particular Notions of the *Vindictive Juſtice of God*, which according to him could not have any other way been ſatisfied.

Let us examine however this Libeller's Reaſons, which are theſe two: (1.) (*c*) He ſays, *The Perſon muſt be infinite, who could pay an infinite Debt, for ſuch is Sin, being an offence againſt infinite Goodneſs.* If this Reaſon holds, then all Sins are equal, becauſe every Sin, as ſuch, is an offence againſt infinite Goodneſs. Now, if a Poſition be falſe, then all reaſonings founded upon that Poſition muſt be falſe likewiſe.

(*c*) Ibid. *p.* 9. *col.* 1.

(2.) He argues from our Saviour's Prayer, *Matth.* 26. 39. (*d*) *Father, if it be poſſible, let this Cup paſs from me.* Which Prayer, ſays this Libeller, ſhews, *That it was not poſſible* for him to accompliſh the Salvation of Man, which he had undertaken, without ſuffering Death; *Otherwiſe* (as he wiſely adds) *no doubt God would not have refuſed the Petition of his well-beloved Son.* This ſecond Reaſon is as weak as the former; and its weakneſs lies in not conſidering how any thing may be ſaid to be *impoſſible* with God: Either (1.) Becauſe it implies a contradiction in it ſelf: Or, (2.) Becauſe God has already otherwiſe decreed. In this ſecond Senſe, it was *impoſſible* that the Cup ſhould paſs from our Bleſſed Saviour, when he prayed, that it might, in the Garden. It was decreed that the Man Chriſt Jeſus ſhould ſuffer Death in the ſtead of ſinful Man, to ſave him from Death: This Decree being once paſt, it became irreverſible, Immutability being one of the Eſſential Attributes of God. And this ſhews why *it was not poſſible* for the Cup to paſs from the Man Chriſt Jeſus who ſuffered, and who prayed that he might not Suffer, becauſe his

(*d*) Ibid.

his Sufferings were decreed before the Foundations of the World were laid.

SECT. VIII.

The Archbiſhop Vindicated from the Charge of Advancing a Socinian Covenant.

ONE would think 'twere Folly, but 'tis only Malice in this Libeller, to charge the Archbiſhop with (*e*) *ſetting up a* Socinian *Covenant, and excluding the Satisfaction of Chriſt*, when he ſays (*f*), "That upon the Sufferings of Chriſt, "God enter'd into a Covenant of Grace and Mercy with "Mankind; wherein he engaged himſelf to forgive the Sins "of thoſe who Believe and Repent, and to make them Par- "takers of Eternal Life.

(*e*) Ibid. *p.* 9. *col.* 2.

(*f*) Sermon of Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 33.

Now, whether the Archbiſhop do's really *ſet up a* Socinian *Covenant*, and exclude the Satisfaction of Chriſt, will appear by the Context. He ſays therefore (*g*), "That tho "the term Satisfaction be no where uſed in Scripture in this "Senſe, yet (*h*) ſince God is graciouſly pleaſed to accept "of the Sacrifice of the Blood of Chriſt which was ſhed "upon the Croſs, *for the Debt which we ow'd to his Juſtice*; "and to declare himſelf fully pleaſed and contented with it, "why it may not properly enough be called *Payment* or *Sa- "tisfaction*, I confeſs I am not able to underſtand. Not "that God was angry with his Son, when he thus laid on him "the Iniquity of us all; no, he was always well pleaſed "with him; and never better, than when he *became obedient "to the Death, even the Death of the Croſs*, and *bore our Sins in "his own Body on the Tree*. Nor yet, that our Saviour ſuffer'd "the very ſame that the Sinner ſhould have ſuffer'd, namely, "the proper Pains and Torment of the damned. But that "his Obedience and Sufferings were of that value and "eſteem with God, and his voluntary Sacrifice of himſelf "ſo well-pleaſing to him, that he thereupon enter'd into a "Covenant of Grace and Mercy with Mankind, wherein he "hath.

(*g*) Ibid. *p.* 31.

(*h*) Ibid. *p.* 32.

"hath engaged himſelf to forgive the Sins of thoſe who Be-
"lieve and Repent, and to make them Partakers of Eternal
"Life.

(*i*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 9. *col.* 2.

To ſay after all this, That (*i*) *the Covenant* which God made *with Chriſt* according to the Archbiſhop, *was wholly Cauſeleſs, Needleſs, and Arbitrary*, or *that the Archbiſhop holds with the* Socinians, *by excluding the Satisfaction* made to the Divine Juſtice by the Effuſion of the Blood of Chriſt upon the Croſs, *from being any part of the Covenant, or conſider'd at all in it*, is as black a Calumny as could well be contained in ſo ſmall a compaſs of words.

SECT. IX.

The Charge Anſwered about Chriſt's Sacrifice.

(*k*) Sermon of Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 44.

(*l*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 6. *col.* 2.

HE cavils at the Archbiſhop for ſaying (*k*), "That God "did not command his Son to be ſacrificed, but his "Providence permitted the wickedneſs and violence of Man "to put him to Death. And then he both fooliſhly and maliciouſly asks (*l*), "If there were no more than God's "bare Permiſſion in the Sacrifice of Chriſt, as in all other "wicked Actions; how was his Death more a Sacrifice than "the Death of any other Man?

One would think that this Libeller never heard of God's making uſe of the wickedneſs and follies of Men to bring about his own righteous and holy Purpoſes. And there needs no pains to prove, according to this Libeller, that God is directly the Author of Sin. For the Archbiſhop here was only ſpeaking of the *manner* how Chriſt was put to Death, which he tells us, was not by God's commanding the *Jews* to require, or *Pontius Pilate* to deliver up Jeſus to be crucified, but by his ſuffering the one to purſue their execrably malicious purpoſe, and the other timorouſly to be their Executioner, without mentioning one ſyllable of the reaſon why God thus permitted it; that came under his Second Head, and he do's here, *in terminis*, diſtinguiſh the *manner* of doing it, from the deſign why it was done. This is plain from the

the Archbiſhop's words, and it is a full Anſwer to all that malicious Harangue which our Libeller makes upon this occaſion, concerning God's commanding, and not barely permitting his well-beloved Son to be a Sacrifice for the Sins of Mankind.

SECT. X.

Of the Socinians *owning a* Satisfaction.

IN examining the Controverſy between us and the *Socinians*, concerning the Satisfaction of Chriſt, the Archbiſhop finds, That they have owned ſo much as makes their refuſing to acknowledge that our Bleſſed Saviour ſuffered *in our ſtead*, to be little more than a Controverſy about words. Becauſe whilſt they aſſert that he dy'd *for our Benefit*, they muſt mean as we do, who ſay, That Chriſt died *in our ſtead*, that is to ſay (*m*), "That by virtue of his Death and Suf- "ferings, he ſaved us from the Wrath of God, and procured "our eſcape from Eternal Death; which (ſays the Arch- "biſhop) for ought I know, is all that any body means by "his dying *in our ſtead*. From which words our Libeller takes an occaſion ſpitefully to inſinuate, that the Archbiſhop ſays this with an intention to give up the Cauſe to his *beloved Socinians*, as this Calumniator calls them.

(*m*) Sermon of Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 48.

To judge between the Archbiſhop and this Libeller, 'tis neceſſary to ſee what the Archbiſhop has done in this Sermon. (1.) He has proved at large by ample Teſtimonies from Scripture, and the Nature and Intention of Expiatory Sacrifices, and as underſtood and practiſed by all Mankind, that our Bleſſed Saviour was truly an Expiatory Sacrifice, did really make an Atonement, and conſequently did literally ſuffer *in our ſtead*. (2.) Then he ſhewed that the *Socinians* do acknowledg what is in a manner an equivalent to this, namely, That Jeſus Chriſt ſuffered *for our Benefit*; and conſequently, that (according to them) his Obedience and Sufferings in their meritorious conſequence redound as much to our advantage as we pretend and ſay they do. From whence he concludes, that the

(*n*) Ibid. the *Socinians* have kept up a (*n*) *perverſe Contention* to diſturb the peace of the Church.

If this be true, (and that it is true, appears to every one that reads the Sermon) where's the harm of ſaying ſo? Do's a Man join with any Party of Men, when he accuſes them of *Perverſeneſs* and *Contentiouſneſs*, for not ſpeaking in the Language of the Scripture and the Church, whilſt in the main they agree to what he ſays? Or, do's he give up a Cauſe, who proves that his ſide, and not his Adverſaries, ſpeak the Language of the Scriptures? On the contrary, can there be any more likely way to bring the *Socinians* into the Communion of the Church, and to perſuade them to renounce their Hereſy, than to let them ſee that in ſome of the chiefeſt Points about which great and warm Diſputes have ariſen, they do really hold the ſame things with the Catholick Church? A good Man diſputes not for Victory, but for Truth, and he knows that he do's not betray his Cauſe, when he ſhews his Adverſaries what unreaſonable Men they are, to raiſe a Duſt about a thing wherein at the bottom there is very little if any diſagreement.

SECT. XI.

Of the Socinian *way of Diſputing.*

THE Archbiſhop having in his Second Sermon, *Concerning the Incarnation of our Bleſſed Saviour*, taken an occaſion to give a Character of the *Socinians* way of diſputing, (*o*) Page 71. Among other things he ſays (*o*), "That *generally* they are a "Pattern of the fair way of diſputing, and of debating Mat-"ters of Religion without Heat and unſeemly Reflections "upon their Adverſaries. They *generally* argue Matters with "that Temper and Gravity, and with that freedom from "Paſſion and Tranſport, which becomes a ſerious and weigh-"ty Argument. And *for the moſt part*, they reaſon cloſely "and clearly, with extraordinary guard and caution, with "great dexterity and decency, and yet with ſmartneſs and "ſubtilty enough; with a very gentle heat, and few hard "words.

" words. In a word, they are the ſtrongeſt Managers of a " weak Cauſe, and which is ill founded at the bottom, that " *perhaps* ever yet medled with Controverſy. Inſomuch, that " *ſome* of the Proteſtants, and *the generality* of the Popiſh " Writers, and even of the Jeſuits themſelves, are in compa- " riſon of them but meer Scolds and Bunglers.

Upon all this our Libeller paſſes this good-natur'd and righteous Cenſure. (*p*) " A Man could hardly deſcribe his " Miſtreſs in a ſofter Air. The *Socinians* muſt be very ill-na- " tur'd if they take any thing amiſs which this Gentleman " has ſaid againſt them. It was meer neceſſity; they ſee how " unwillingly and artificially he has done it; and when rightly " underſtood (no doubt they underſtand him) what he has " ſaid, is with a deſign to give a better Account of them than " has yet been done, to take off that frightful Character with " which ſome have painted them, not allowing them the very " Name of Chriſtians. Whereas alas! the Doctor has told us, " that there is nothing betwixt them and us, but a *meer Con-* " *troverſy about Words*, which all mean the ſame thing.

(*p*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 10. *col.* 1, 2.

It is hardly poſſible to miſrepreſent a Man more ſlanderouſly than the Archbiſhop is here miſrepreſented in ſo few words. No man that ever looked much into the *Fratres Poloni*, but knows the Archbiſhop's Character of the *Socinian* Writers, as far as they are concerned in it, to be ſtrictly true. Of *them*, and *them only* the Archbiſhop ſpeaks; for this Sermon was preached in 1679. before any of thoſe virulent Pamphlets, which the *Socinians* have of late years been diſperſing about the Nation, were publiſht. That calmneſs of theirs did their buſineſs at that time in a very great degree, and did but too too much inſinuate into the Affection of thoſe that read their Writings. The *Socinians* were then ſetled, after a ſort, in a Popiſh Country, where they knew all the Eccleſiaſticks were their mortal Enemies, from whom they looked for nothing but a total Extirpation, which at laſt befel them between thirty and forty years ago. Their only ſupport during their Eſtabliſhment lay in ſome of the Nobility and People of Quality, ſeveral of whom ſent their Children to *Racow* to be educated, where the *Socinians* had gotten leave to erect an Academy. Theſe Men knew very well that ſuch ſort of Followers as theirs, were

only to be led by a calm and Gentleman-like way of writing and preaching, joined with a certain ſimplicity of manners, and innocency of Life; in all which things, if we may believe the Accounts which have been printed concerning them, they were more than ordinarily Eminent. All this the Archbiſhop was no ſtranger to. As for our Libeller, which is greateſt, his Ignorance, or his Malice, I will not take upon me to determine.

But to make his Calumny go down, he lays down two ſhameleſs untruths. (1.) He ſays that the Doctor (as he rudely calls the Archbiſhop) has told us, That *there is nothing betwixt the* Socinians *and us, but a mere Controverſy about Words*; when he knows that the Archbiſhop never ſaid any thing like it of the Diſputes *concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation*; all that he ſaid, was *concerning the Satisfaction of Chriſt*, the Catholick Doctrine concerning which, he proves the *Socinians* to hold in effect, tho in words they diſown it. But this has been ſpoken to already. (2.) He makes the Archbiſhop ſay, That *all the Chriſtian Writers are but Scolds and Bunglers to the* Socinians; which is notoriouſly falſe. The Archbiſhop ſays only, *Some of the Proteſtant Writers*, and *the generality of the Popiſh*; which words *ſome*, and *the generality*, are very reſtrictive Terms, and which being uſed, make the Archbiſhop's Propoſition literally true.

(q) Tritheiſm charged upon Dr. *Sherlock's* Notion, *&c.* p. 304.

And yet, as plainly as theſe words are expreſſed, a Writer of a much higher Rank than this Libeller, ſays (*q*), "That he "cannot come up to the *Lambeth*-ſtrain in declaring the *Soci-* "*nians* the *only* Scholars and Diſputants in the World, in "compariſon of whom, ſome of the moſt Eminent upon both "accounts that *Chriſtendom* ever had, are but mere Bunglers. Now, as he directly points at what has been quoted from the Archbiſhop in theſe words, ſo he does as plainly know that he miſrepreſents him by leaving out the limiting words *ſome*, and *the generality*, which would have deſtroy'd his ſpiteful *inuendo*, and have contradicted all that he makes the Archbiſhop ſay, *That the* Socinians *were the only Scholars and Diſputants in the World*; which laſt words, or ſomething equivalent, he is here challenged to produce out of the Archbiſhop's Writings, or to own that he has *calumniated* the firſt Prelate of that Church,

of

of which himſelf is a Member, and in which he is believed to be preferred. And this, let me tell him, is a Crime which in the Primitive Church would not have been overlook'd in any private Presbyter whatſoever, let his Merits have been what they would, and his Zeal in defending the Doctrine of the Church againſt all manner of Innovators never ſo ardent. And ſince ſo great a fault is overlook'd in him, it ought to make him not quite ſo ſevere upon his Governors becauſe they are gentle to other Men, when he knows himſelf to be equally obnoxious upon other accounts. But I muſt return to our Libeller.

He has been at a great deal of pains to gather up all the hard Characters which the Archbiſhop gives of the *Socinian* Arguments, and their way of reaſoning, and then ſets them againſt what he had ſaid in commendation of them before, inſinuating thereby that the Archbiſhop has wilfully contradicted himſelf to keep the *Socinians* favour, whileſt he muſt ſay ſomething at the ſame time to pleaſe the People.

This malicious Method of his is anſwered in three words. (1.) A Man may reaſon very calmly, tho his Arguments be ſtark naught. (2.) The worſe the Cauſe be which a Man undertakes to defend, the greater need he has of Dexterity and Wit to manage it, and of calmneſs and ſoftneſs in propoſing his Arguments to the World, if he intends they ſhall gain admittance. (3.) An impudent Anſwer (*i. e.* ſuch a one as he that uſes, muſt ſuppoſe his Adverſary to want common Conſideration if he ſwallows it) may be ſoftly expreſſed, and dreſſed up with great ſeeming Modeſty. (4.) A Man may in writing a great deal, ſpeak now and then ſome indecent Words, tho the Tenor of his Diſcourſe may in the general be very reſpectful towards the Perſons whom he oppoſes, and the Subject which he treats of.

I ſhall not now affront my Reader ſo much, as to make any Application; for I am ſure, if he has *Common Senſe*, he will ſee how to make it; and if he has *Common Honeſty*, he will then make it juſt as I may be ſuppos'd to deſire he ſhould.

SECT. XII.

The Charge of undermining the Unity of the Godhead, *Anſwered.*

BUT theſe are light ſtrokes in compariſon of what follows. This Libeller accuſes the Archbiſhop of (*r*) "really undermining the Unity of God, by ſetting it up upon a "Foundation which he himſelf in his Sermon upon that Subject "quite overthrows. The Archbiſhop had aſſerted (*s*), "That "the Unity of the Divine Nature was a Notion wherein the "greateſt and the wiſeſt part of Mankind did always agree; that is, as he explains himſelf preſently after (*t*), "That there "is one Supreme Being, the Author and Cauſe of all, whom "the moſt Ancient of the Heathen Poets commonly called the "Father of gods and men. And yet after this he ſays (*u*), "That the generality of the Heathens were groſly guilty both "of believing more gods, and of worſhipping falſe gods. From which two paſſages laid together, our Libeller infers (*w*), "That the Archbiſhop builds the Unity of God "upon the belief of the *greateſt Part of Mankind*, when he "confeſſes that this *greateſt Part* did not believe the Unity of "God.

(*r*) Page 12. Poſtſcript, *col.* 1.

(*s*) Sermon Concerning the Unity of the Divine Nature, *p.* 8.

(*t*) Ibid.

(*u*) Ibid. *p.* 16.

(*w*) *Page* 12. *col.* 2. Poſtſcript.

This is a downright Calumny, and one of the blackeſt that could be charged upon any Man whatſoever. The deſign of the Archbiſhop in that Sermon was to prove, that whileſt the Heathens generally own'd one Supreme God that was the Principal and Original of all things, they worſhipped ſeveral ſubordinate Deities, really diſtinct from one another at the ſame time; which deſign he executes for ſeveral Pages together. Now to ſhew that this Libeller knew that what he ſaid was a Calumny, as well as I do, when he brings what he calls a *Salvo* for this moſt palpable Contradiction, he quotes the Archbiſhop's words thus (*x*), "The Unity of the "Divine Nature,—— was the Primitive and General Belief "of Mankind, and Polytheiſm and Idolatry were a Corrup-"tion

(*x*) Sermon of Unity of Divine Nature, *p.* 15.

" tion and Degeneracy from the Original Notion which " Mankind had concerning God. Whereas the Sentence in the Archbiſhop's Sermon runs thus, " The Unity of the Di- " vine Nature, *or the Notion of one Supreme God, Creator and* " *Governour of the World,* was the Primitive and General Be- " lief of Mankind: And Polytheiſm and Idolatry were a " Corruption and Degeneracy from the Original Notion " which Mankind had concerning God. Which, as I take it, is ſomething different from what our Libeller would have us believe; the very ſtreſs of the Queſtion lying in thoſe words which he has fraudulently ſuppreſſed. No Man that ever looked into Pagan Antiquity, can deny that the generality of the Ancient Heathens worſhipped many falſe gods. And it has been unanſwerably proved againſt the Papiſts in the Diſputes betwixt us and them, concerning the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome,* That Mankind did generally agree in the Belief of one Supreme Being, to whom all the other Deities were ſubordinate, and by whom they were all either created or begotten.

SECT. XIII.

The Charge of Hobbiſm *Anſwered.*

OUR Libeller is ſo intent upon finding Fault, that he Charges the Archbiſhop with *Hobbiſm* for Preaching Doctrines which are the immediate reſults of *Paſſive Obedience.* In a Sermon Preached ſeveral Years ago before King *Charles* II. the Archbiſhop took an occaſion upon thoſe words of *Joſhua, If it ſeem evil unto you to ſerve the Lord, Chuſe you this day whom you will ſerve,* to diſcourſe of the Power which the Civil Magiſtrate has in matters of Religion. And becauſe a falſe Religion may be legally eſtabliſht in a Nation, as well as a true one, the Queſtion naturally ariſes, Whether thoſe who believe the true Religion are *bound* to endeavour to propagate it in a Countrey where ſevere Laws are made againſt it, and thoſe who teach it? That is to ſay, Whether a Chriſtian in *Japan* is *bound* to preach the Chriſtian Religion in that Countrey,

trey, where he is ſure he ſhall be put to death without mercy, if the Fact be proved upon him, nay, perhaps, if he be but ſuſpected to be a Chriſtian? This the Archbiſhop determines in the Negative, and ſays, (*y*) "That if a falſe Religion be eſtabliſhed by Law, the Caſe here is the ſame as "in all other Laws that are ſinful in the Matter of them, "but yet made by a lawful Authority; in this Caſe the Subject is not *bound* to profeſs a falſe Religion, but patiently to "ſuffer for the conſtant profeſſion of the true. To which he adds theſe words. "And to ſpeak freely in this matter, I "cannot think ('till I be better inform'd, which I am always ready to be) that any pretence of Conſcience warrants any Man that is not extraordinarily Commiſſioned as the Apoſtles and firſt Publiſhers of the Goſpel were, and "cannot juſtify that Commiſſion by Miracles as they did, to "*affront* the eſtabliſht Religion of a Nation (though it be "falſe) and *openly to draw Men off* from the profeſſion of it, "in contempt of the Magiſtrate and the Law: All that Perſons of a different Religion can in ſuch a Caſe reaſonably "pretend to, is to enjoy the private Liberty and Exerciſe of "their own Conſcience and Religion; for which they ought "to be very thankful, and to forbear the open making of "Proſelites to their own Religion, (though they be never ſo "ſure that they are in the right) till they have either an extraordinary Commiſſion from God to that purpoſe, or the "Providence of God make way for it by the permiſſion or "connivance of the Magiſtrate. Not but that every Man "hath a *Right* to publiſh and propagate the true Religion, and "to declare it againſt a falſe one: But there is no *Obligation* "upon any Man to attempt this to no purpoſe, and when "without a Miracle it can have no other effect but the loſs of "his own Life; unleſs he have an immediate Command and "Commiſſion from God to this purpoſe, and be endued with "a Power of Miracles, as a publick Seal and Teſtimony of "that Commiſſion, which was the Caſe of the Apoſtles.

(*y*) Sermon, Vol. 3. Octavo, *p.* 379, 380, 381.

I have tranſcribed the more, to prevent Cavilling, if it be poſſible. Let the Reader now judge of theſe words of our Libeller. "(*z*) His [*i. e.* the Archbiſhop's] Politicks are "*Leviathan*, and his Religion is *Latitudinarian*, which is "none;

(*z*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 13. 2.

" none; that is, nothing that is poſitive, but againſt every " thing that is poſitive in other Religions; whereby to reduce " all Religions to an uncertainty, and determinable only by " the Civil Power: Againſt whoſe command Dr. *T.* do's not " *think it lawful* to preach the Goſpel without ſuch extraor- " dinary Commiſſion as the Apoſtles had, and that we were " able to vouch it with Miracles, as they did: Which is as " much as *Hobbs* himſelf could have asked, if he had got into " the Pulpit in Perſon, and not his Deputy.

The Archbiſhop ſays, That every Man has a *right* to publiſh and propagate the true Religion, and to declare it againſt a falſe one; but is under no *Obligation* ſo to do to no purpoſe, and with apparent hazard of his Life, unleſs he have an immediate Command and Commiſſion from God himſelf, and be endued with a Power of Miracles. This Libeller ſays, That the Archbiſhop do's *not think it lawful* to do all this againſt the Command of the Civil Magiſtrate. This is too groſs to need a deſcant.

SECT. XIV.

The Charge about Revealed Religion *Anſwered.*

HIS next ſtrokes againſt the Archbiſhop's Sermon before the Houſe of Commons, *Nov.* 5. 1678, are of a like Nature. The Archbiſhop's deſign in that Sermon, was ſuitably to the occaſion of the Day to ſhew the unjuſtifiableneſs of that furious Zeal by which the Papiſts endeavour to exterminate thoſe of a contrary perſwaſion from themſelves, out of the Countries wherein they have Power. Our Saviour's words to his Diſciples, when they were angry with the *Samaritans*, and would have had him have called for Fire from Heaven to deſtroy them as *Elias* did, becauſe they affronted him when they perceived that he was going up to *Jeruſalem*, *Ye know not what ſpirit ye are of*; *the ſon of man is not come to deſtroy mens lives, but to ſave them*: I ſay, theſe words of our Saviour's gave the Archbiſhop an opportunity to diſcourſe with more Authority upon this Matter, than otherwiſe he could well have done.

Among

Among other Topicks uſed by the Archbiſhop to urge this point, one great one was drawn from the Nature of Religion, which is chiefly intended to make us like God here, that ſo we may be happy with him hereafter. Now (*a*) becauſe it is impoſſible for us to be like God, *When our Religion ſerves to no other purpoſe but to be a Bond of Conſpiracy, to inflame our Tempers to a greater fierceneſs, and to ſet a keener edge upon our Spirits* than they had before, ſo that inſtead of being the better for it, we ſhall certainly be the worſe; therefore, and therefore only was it that the Archbiſhop ſaid (*b*), "That it "were better there were no Revealed Religion, and that "human Nature were left to the conduct of its own Prin- "ciples and Inclinations, which are much more Mild and "Merciful, much more for the Peace and Happineſs of hu- "man Society, than to be acted by a Religion that inſpires "Men with ſo wild a Fury, and prompts them to commit "ſuch Outrages; and is continually ſupplanting Govern- "ment, and undermining the welfare of Mankind.

(*a*) Vol. 3. Serm. *p.* 18.

(*b*) Ibid.

It is the (*c*) *outward welfare of Mankind*, ſays this ſlanderous Libeller, that the Archbiſhop is ſtill ſpeaking of; whereby he would inſinuate, that the Archbiſhop teaches, That the chiefeſt and almoſt only conſideration of Religion, is to reſpect the Peace and Quietneſs of this World: And therefore he clips the foregoing and ſome other Sentences of this Sermon out from the reſt, and then makes his own Gloſſes upon them. Even out of the Sentence already quoted, he leaves out theſe words, *That inſpires Men with ſo wild a Fury, and prompts them to commit ſuch Outrages*, which give another turn to the Sentence, and ſhew the true Reaſon why ſuch a Religion is ſo very dangerous, that *even Atheiſm and Infidelity cannot have worſe things ſaid of them*, than may be truly ſaid of ſo Bloody a Religion as this. It is as manifeſt as the Sun, and viſible to any one that reads the Archbiſhop's Sermon never ſo carelefly, that his great warmth againſt the Church of *Rome*, and its furious Zeal againſt Hereticks, which he expoſes in that Sermon, proceeds only from his juſt Indignation, that under a pretence of propagating our common Chriſtianity, which teaches us to be like God, it ſhould inſpire Mankind with Principles truly deviliſh: That ſo, like the Phariſees Proſelites, its

(*c*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 14. *col.* 2.

its Sons ſhould become ten times more the Children of Darkneſs than otherwiſe they would have been. The Archbiſhop ſays nothing, he inſinuates nothing like what our Libeller affixes upon him, and that any Man may ſee that reads that Sermon, and conſequently thoſe ſcraps of Quotations in their proper places.

For to what purpoſe ſhould any Religion be believed and practiſed, if it does not anſwer the end for which it was enjoined? If it leads us to Practiſes directly oppoſite to thoſe Idea's which we muſt neceſſarily form to our ſelves of God, can we be in a worſe condition by being Infidels, than by living up to the Precepts of ſuch a Religion? If this be not plain, I know not what is: But there is no fence againſt fouldealing, and any thing may be made out of any thing, if Men will take a liberty to pick up broken Sentences from different places in Mens Writings, without attending to the Context, and then putting them together again as they pleaſe.

SECT. XV.

The Charge about Mothers Nurſing their Children, *proved to be impertinent.*

THE aboveſaid Courſe is the moſt uſual way of miſrepreſenting Mens Opinions, but it is not the only one. Sometimes the plain meaning of ſingle and abſolute Sentences may be wilfully miſconſtrued, when Men are reſolved againſt common Candour. Such a miſconſtruction I charge upon our Libeller, in his Harangue upon theſe words of the Archbiſhop's in his Firſt Sermon *Concerning the Education of Children.* (*d*) "Mothers nurſing of their own Children is a natural "Duty: And becauſe it is ſo, of a more neceſſary and indiſ"penſable Obligation than any poſitive Precept of Revealed "Religion. (*d*) *Page* 103.

Here, thinks he, I have a fair field before me to expoſe the Archbiſhop; and I will ſpare nothing that (as far as lies in

my power) ſhall effectually do it. And therefore thus he cries out; "(e) But it is not only matters of ſuch conſequence as Government, which the Doctor prefers to Revealed Religion: But to ſhew his utmoſt contempt of it, he "has found out ſo very mean a thing to compare to it, and "prefer before it, as muſt ſurprize and aſtoniſh every Chriſtian Reader. He makes a Woman's giving out her Child "to Nurſe, to be a more heinous matter, than to renounce "Chriſt and all Revealed Religion. And then after quoting the Archbiſhop's words, he tells us, (f) "That the Belief of "Chriſt is nothing elſe but a poſitive Precept of Revealed "Religion. And ſo on.

(e) Charge of Socin. *p.* 14. *col.* 2.

(f) Ibid. *p.* 15. *col.* 1.

True Malice is always as fooliſh as it is miſchievous: otherwiſe this would never have been objected. *Common Senſe* has for many Ages taught Divines to diſtinguiſh between the *Credenda* and the *Agenda* of Chriſtianity; between the things we are *to believe*, and the things we are *to practiſe*; and the ſame *Common Senſe* taught every Reader of this Sermon of the Archbiſhop's, till our Libeller came and informed us better, that the Archbiſhop compared only practical Duties together, when he preferred the natural Duty of Womens nurſing their own Children to any poſitively enjoined practical Duty of a Revealed Religion: And therefore there was no need to put in the word *practical* after *poſitive*, becauſe the Thing ſpoke it ſelf. For the Archbiſhop wrote to thoſe that would read, becauſe they knew they wanted Inſtruction, not to thoſe that read only to find fault; and the former ſort he was ſure would always join candor to humility, and then he was equally certain, that he ſhould neither be miſunderſtood, nor miſrepreſented.

SECT.

SECT. XVI.

The Charge anſwered of Comparing the Archbiſhop with Mr. Blount, *&c.*

IT is not long ſince two blaſphemous and impertinent Books have been diſperſed about, one called *Great is Diana of the Epheſians, or the Original of Idolatry*, written by *Charles Blount*; the other entituled, *A Hiſtory of Religion*, written by *Sir Poſitive At-all*, a very great Reformer, and a very notable Man. The Deſign of theſe two Men is to ridicule the Chriſtian Religion under two different views, though without offering at one ſingle Reaſon why it ought to be ridicul'd: And this the former does under colour of expoſing the Heathens, and the latter the Papiſts. The Hiſtorian quotes the Archbiſhop in his Preface with great reſpect: *Blount* ſays ſome things to which our dreaming Libeller fancies he can find ſomewhat that is very like in the Archbiſhop's Sermons. Hereupon (as if theſe two Men had enter'd into a Confederacy with the Archbiſhop to deſtroy all Religion) this Libeller writes a long Supplement to his Libel, wherein he compares the Archbiſhop's Sermons to theſe two Execrable Pamphlets; and ſtill takes care to repreſent the Archbiſhop's Doctrine as the worſt of the three. Several things in that Supplement are peculiarly level'd at thoſe two Diſcourſes, without any immediate relation to the Archbiſhop, by which our Libeller ſhews, that he can write well, and reaſon juſtly, when he pleaſes, which makes him the more unexcuſable when he does not. But all that he ſays of the Archbiſhop is ſo very ſpiteful, and ſo very *unjuſt*, that I think nothing can exceed it. I ſay *unjuſt*, becauſe it is founded upon thoſe individual Paſſages which have been conſider'd at large already: And which have been proved to contain nothing in them contrary to the Deſign of the Chriſtian Religion, and which conſequently can never be compared with the Writings of an Atheiſt, (or Deiſt, it matters not which) without the higheſt injury poſſible.

There is but one Paſſage produced out of the Archbiſhop's Writings in the Supplement, but what has been ſpoken to already; and that is this, (*g*) "In this Diſpenſation of "God's Grace and Mercy to Mankind, by the death of his "Son, God ſeems to have gone to the very extremity of "things, and *almoſt* further than Goodneſs and Juſtice will "well admit, to afflict Innocency it ſelf to ſave the Guilty: "— It looks *almoſt* like hatred of Innocency and his own "Son. This Sentence of the Archbiſhop's our Libeller compares with the following Paſſage of *Charles Blount's*, (*h*) "As "if the Almighty Juſtice could be no otherwiſe appeaſed for "the Errors of the Wicked, but by the Sufferings of the In-"nocent. And concludes thus, (*i*) "Theſe two *Almoſts* [of "the Archbiſhop's] are like two *Greek* Negatives, which make "an Affirmative: And ſhew this Doctor to be both almoſt "and altogether ſuch a Chriſtian as his Diſciple *Blount*.

(*g*) Sermon concerning the Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, *p.* 52, 53.

(*h*) Great *Diana*, p. 15.

(*i*) Charge of Socin. *p.* 26. *col.* 2.

Before I ſay any thing to all this Stuff, I muſt take notice, that this Libeller ſeveral times inſinuates, that *Charles Blount* was an intimate Friend of the Archbiſhop's: Whereas I am very well aſſur'd, that when he came to the Archbiſhop's upon a pretended Caſe of Conſcience, not long before his unfortunate End, the Archbiſhop did not know his Face, though they diſcourſed together for ſome time; in which time *Blount* ſaying ſome odd things, it gave the Archbiſhop a curioſity to enquire who he was; which Curioſity does not ſo well conſiſt with that Friendſhip that our Libeller would make the World believe there was between them. So that his Truth, as an Hiſtorian, is as little to be valu'd, as his Juſtice as a Reaſoner. But to return to our Subject.

When he has thus ſpit his Venom, he takes out the Poyſon in the next words (*k*), "And indeed, without the Do-"ctrine of the Satisfaction, there can *no rational Account be* "*given* for the typical Sacrifices before Chriſt came, and "much leſs for his Sacrifice who was Innocency it ſelf. Theſe words do not ſhew his *prudence* in managing his own Cauſe, ſo much as the foregoing Sentence ſhew'd his Malice: For what he here owns, is in effect the very thing which the Archbiſhop aſſerted above; namely, That according to the Rules of Human Prudence, God's Diſpenſation in ſaving Mankind

(*k*) Ibid.

Mankind could be but very difficultly accounted for; which is no more than what St. *Paul* argues at large, 1 *Cor.* 1. For thus the Apoſtle reaſons, when he ſays, That that which was a *ſtumbling-block* to the *Jews* upon one account, who thereby loſt their expectation of a Temporal *Meſſiah*, was *fooliſhneſs* to the *Greeks* upon another, becauſe they could not reconcile it to the Principles of their Philoſophy, which was nothing but natural Reaſon improv'd by Thought and Study. The whole Doctrine of Satisfaction as revealed, it is what theſe Philoſophers could never have thought of; and therefore when we are to give an account of what Natural Reaſon would judge of the Death of Chriſt, we muſt ſay, that therein *God ſeems to have gone to the very extremity of things, and almoſt further than Goodneſs and Juſtice will well admit*: And if ſo, then this is an admirable Topick from which to perſuade Men to Holineſs, (which was the Uſe the Archbiſhop made of it) by exhorting them to conſider *what a wonderful way God took to expreſs his hatred of Sin by*; even ſuch a one as, according to Human ways of reaſoning, *look'd almoſt like hatred of Innocency and his own Son*.

Whether now it follows from hence that the Archbiſhop is *almoſt, and altogether ſuch a Chriſtian as Charles Blount*, this Libeller himſelf ſhall judge, provided he will take St. *Paul* in, (*l*) who ſays the very ſame thing that the Archbiſhop does, tho in other words.

(*l*) 1 *Cor.* 1. 18, *&c.* to the end of the Chapter.

No Man can well judge of Sentences, unleſs he takes in the Context, eſpecially in a continu'd Diſcourſe. *Charles Blount* had been impiouſly ridiculing Sacrifices as ſuch, aſcribing their Invention to ſome Crafty and Deſigning Prieſts, and then concludes, *As if the Almighty Juſtice could no otherwiſe be appeaſed for the Errors of the Wicked, but by the ſufferings of the Innocent.* The Archbiſhop was exhorting Men to hate and deteſt Sin which had coſt God ſo dear, that he gave the dearly beloved of his Soul to death; nay he ſeemed according to Human reaſoning, *to have gone to the very extremity of things, almoſt further than Goodneſs and Juſtice would well admit.*

Is here now any thing alike? Could any thing but Malice, mixt with Folly, raiſe ſuch a Suggeſtion? When our Libeller himſelf takes pains to prove, that nothing but Infinite Wiſdom could

could have found out ſuch a Method to redeem us, and which conſequently muſt ſeem *fooliſhneſs*, as the Apoſtle expreſly ſays it does, to our ſhallow Underſtandings, which would be dazled with things ſo much above our Comprehenſion.

SECT. XVII.

The Concluſion.

BUT it is time now to give over; it is a tedious thing to take notice of every malicious Expreſſion which are many times repeated, and may be met with in almoſt every Period of this Libel. I do not remember that I have omitted any one Accuſation: I have quoted our Libeller and the Archbiſhop too with all poſſible exactneſs, and I am not conſcious to my ſelf that I have weakned any one of his Reflections in the repetition: And as I have dealt with him aboveboard, ſo I am not afraid of any Reply that can be made to what I have ſaid. His Words, which are faithfully cited, vindicate me from being thought to uſe too much ſharpneſs towards him, for which otherwiſe, perhaps, I might have been eſteemed blame-worthy in my way of treating him. When Men write like Gentlemen and Chriſtians, they ought to be tenderly handled; and if they do not, yet even then Retaliation is not allowable; and that, I think, I am very far from returning upon this Libeller; and ſo, I believe, the impartial Reader will readily grant upon examining what we both have ſaid.

What I have written was due to the Memory of that Great Man, whom I have endeavoured to defend. No pains has been ſpared to blacken him ſince his Death; abundance of little Stories have been gather'd up, or made on purpoſe to defame him; and that by Men, who, one would have thought, might have ſpent their Time to much better purpoſe. That their Calumnies might be the better liſtned to, this *Prodromus* was firſt ſent out to prepare the World to believe what they ſhould ſay; for they knew it would be no hard thing to bring Men

Men to credit any Stories, though never ſo horrid, of thoſe who were already repreſented as *Atheiſts*, and *Super-Hobbiſts*. But I think I have proved this Libeller to be a *ſlanderous Calumniator* pretty ſufficiently in the foregoing Paper, which, if I miſtake not, will affect his Fellow-Libellers, who have commended this Libel of his in print. It is not ſo much the Archbiſhop, as thoſe who have communicated with him, that are ſtruck at in theſe ſort of Pamphlets; and the thing theſe Men aim at, is, that every Biſhop and Presbyter of the Church of *England* that have owned Dr. *Tillotſon* to be Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, may be eſteemed not only as Betrayers of the Church's Rights, but alſo as Betrayers of the Chriſtian Religion it ſelf, by acknowledging his Authority whom they have endeavour'd to prove to have been not ſo much as a Chriſtian. But I hope the detection of thoſe notorious Falſhoods which this Libeller has vented againſt Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s Memory, will teach the unbiaſſed part of the Nation what may reaſonably be believed of all thoſe Stories, which thoſe who have publickly commended this Libel have themſelves publiſh'd againſt a Man who is not now able to anſwer for himſelf.

FINIS.

Books Printed for Richard Chiſwèll.

A Diſcourſe of the Paſtoral Care. By *Gilbert Burnet*, D. D. Lord Biſhop of *Sarum*. 1692.

——his Four Diſcourſes delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceſs of *Sarum*: Concerning, I. The Truth of the Chriſtian Religion. II. The Divinity and Death of Chriſt. iII. The Infallibility and Authority of the Church. IV. The Obligations to continue in the Communion of the Church. 8*vo*. 1694.

——his Sermon at the Funeral of Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*. 1694.

——his Sermon preached before the King at St. *James*'s Chappel, on the 10th of *February*, 169$\frac{4}{5}$. being the Firſt Sunday in *Lent*, on 2 *Cor*. 6 1.

A Commentary on the Firſt Book of *Moſes* called *Geneſis*. By the Right Reverend *Simon*, Lord Biſhop of *Ely*. 4*to*. 1695.

The *Poſſibility*, and *Expediency*, and *Neceſſity of Divine Revelation*. A Sermon preached at St. *Martin's in the Fields*, January 7. 169$\frac{4}{5}$. at the beginning of the Lecture for the Enſuing Year; Founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle*, Eſq;. By *John Williams*, D. D.

——his *Certainty of Divine Revelation*. Being his Second Sermon preached at the ſaid Lecture. 1695.

——his *Characters of Divine Revelation*. Being his Third Sermon preached at the ſaid Lecture. 1695.

——his Vindication of the Sermons of his Grace *John Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, concerning the *Divinity and Incarnation of our Bleſſed Saviour*; and of the *Lord Biſhop of Worceſter*'s Sermon on the *Myſteries of the Chriſtian Faith*, from the Exceptions of a Late *Socinian Book*, Intituled, (*Conſiderations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity.*) To which is annexed a Letter from the *Lord Biſhop of Sarum* to the Author of the ſaid *Vindication* on the ſame ſubject.

——his Sermon preached at St. *Laurence Jewry*, *Sept*. 28. 1695. at the Election of the Lord Mayor for the Year enſuing.

Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s Sermons of Sincerity and Conſtancy in the Faith and Profeſſion of the True Religion. 8*vo*. 1695.

☞ *Another Volume of his Sermons preached on Several Occaſions, never yet Printed, is in the Preſs, and will be publiſhed this* Michaelmas *Term.*

Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*'s Book Entituled, *A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, againſt the Imputations of* Gilbert *Lord Biſhop of* Sarum. 4*to*. 1695.

Remarks of an Univerſity-Man upon a late Book, falſly called, *A Vindication of the Primitive Fathers, againſt the Imputations of* Gilbert *Lord Biſhop of* Sarum, *written by Mr.* Hill of Killmington.

A Diſcourſe upon 1 *Pet*. IV. 8. wherein the Power and Efficacy of Charity, as it is a means to procure the *Pardon of Sin*, is Explained and Vindicated: By the Reverend Mr. *John Whitefoot*, Sen. of *Norwich*. 8*vo*. Printed for *William Graves* of *Cambridge*; and ſold by *Ric. Chiſwell*.